

INTERNATIONAL UNDERGRADUATES AND DISCOURSES OF
INTERNATIONALIZATION: EXPLORING CONCEPTUALIZATIONS
AND EXPERIENCES OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF
HIGHER EDUCATION AND REPRESENTATIONS OF
INTERNATIONAL UNDERGRADUATES AT A
U.S. UNIVERSITY

by

Kristin Elisabeth Hiller

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Linguistics

The University of Utah

December 2015

Copyright © Kristin Elisabeth Hiller 2015

All Rights Reserved

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of Kristin Elisabeth Hiller
has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

<u>MaryAnn Christison</u>	, Chair	<u>May 14, 2015</u> Date Approved
<u>Kathleen M. Bailey</u>	, Member	<u>May 14, 2015</u> Date Approved
<u>Amy A. Bergerson</u>	, Member	<u>May 14, 2015</u> Date Approved
<u>Johanna Watzinger-Tharp</u>	, Member	<u>May 14, 2015</u>
<u>Steven Sternfeld</u>		<u>May 14, 2015</u> Date Approved

and by Edward J. Rubin, Chair of
the Department of Linguistics

and by David B. Kieda, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

International undergraduate students comprise a recently growing population in U.S. higher education institutions that has been relatively underrepresented in research on the internationalization of higher education (IHE). The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of individual international undergraduates, faculty, administrators, and staff at a U.S. university; their conceptualizations of IHE; and the discourses that constitute and are constituted by their perspectives.

This exploratory qualitative study was carried out at the University of Utah (UU), an institution chosen for its stated commitment to internationalization and global engagement and whose international student population grew approximately 75% between 2006 and 2014. It employed interview, observation, and document analysis data construction strategies. Ten students and ten university faculty, administrators, and staff participated in the interviews. A *bricolage* of multiple forms of analysis was employed to make sense of the participants' experiences, identify discourses, and question assumptions and categories.

The analysis identified (1) variation in views of what and who are involved in campus internationalization and the extent of participation expected; (2) dilemmas that UU community members experience when IHE is viewed in the framework of diverse cultures of learning and cultural synergy; (3) opportunities for and orientations to intercultural learning and language use at UU; and (4) competing discourses and labels

constituting international students and legitimating language use at UU. The main discursive strategies identified were negative representations of international students as burdens within discourses of deficit; representations of international students as resources, which often served to commodify the students; the construction of the Other as the one who bears responsibility to change, absolving the university and host country national faculty, staff, and students of responsibility; and discourses of legitimacy and illegitimacy that constitute and normalize the “good student” and regulate language use.

The findings serve as reminders of the constituting power of language and discourse. The research also identified several strengths as well as areas for improvement in internationalization at UU, specifically, in the development of intercultural competence, in opportunities for language learning and use, and the development of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogies.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
Chapters	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Internationalization of Higher Education	3
Problematizing Internationalization	4
Problematizing International Student Support	7
Journey and Orientation to(wards) the Research	8
Situating the Research	9
Research Questions	14
II LITERATURE ON INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS	16
Internationalization of Higher Education (IHE)	16
Conceptualizing IHE: Definitions, Rationales, and Frameworks	16
Definitions of IHE	17
Internationalization at home	19
Rationales for IHE	20
Conceptual frameworks	23
IHE and diversity	27
Curricular Innovation and Faculty Involvement in IHE	33
Role of language in internationalization	39
Role of culture in internationalization	42
International Students	45
Recruitment	45
Roles and perceptions	50
Support	55
Barriers to Internationalization	62
Critical Examinations of IHE	63
Marketization of IHE	64
Ideologies and discourses of IHE	66

Conceptualizations of and orientations to IHE	71
Summary of IHE Research	74
Rationale for the Study and Contributions to the Field	75
III METHODOLOGY	76
Overall Approach and Orientation to Research	76
Conceptual Framework	81
Context	86
Research Site	87
Participants	89
International students	91
University staff	95
Reciprocity	97
Data	98
Data Construction and Management	98
Documents	100
Interviews	101
Observations	102
Reflexive research journal	103
Research log	104
Data Transformation: Meaning Construction and Problematizing	104
Trustworthiness and Trouble	106
IV UU STUDENT AND STAFF EXPERIENCES AND CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION	110
International Student and Staff Experiences at UU	110
Student Paths to the University of Utah	111
Amber	111
Pam	113
Dan	114
Nancy	115
Xuefang	115
Zhong	116
Fenfang	116
Donghyun	117
Jiyeong	117
Kamon	118
International Student Experiences	121
Expectations and initial experiences at UU: “Everything is different; everything is new.”	122
Adjusting to a new educational system and academic culture	124
Challenges: Language and anxiety	131
Responding to challenges: Strategies	133
Interactions with faculty	136

Interactions with classmates and intercultural learning	139
A Typical Tuesday	144
UU Staff Experiences: Dilemmas, Conflicts, and Opportunities	155
“I recognize my bias when I walk into a classroom [...] but] I don’t know how to offer them the support.”	157
“On one hand culture is underrated as to its impact, and on the other hand I think it’s also over estimated.”	160
“One of the roles that I take seriously is [...] academic culture interpreter.”	163
“There are a lot of things you could do if you actually were committed to [intercultural learning].”	166
Student and Staff Conceptualizations of IHE.....	168
International Student Conceptualizations of IHE.....	170
UU Staff Conceptualizations of IHE.....	174
Globalization and internationalization	182
Internationalization at UU	184
From Internationalization to Global Engagement.....	184
Participant Views of IHE at UU.....	185
 V DISCOURSES OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND LANGUAGE/CULTURE IN THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION	192
Categorization and Lexical Labeling.....	193
International Student Self-Identities: Insider, Outsider, Language Learner, International	194
Labeling IUGs.....	201
Interrogating my own use of lexical labels	210
Discourses of Language, Culture, and Students in IHE	212
Discourse of Difference	212
Constituting the Burden: Negative Representations of International Undergraduates	216
Assigning Responsibility for Intercultural Learning and Adaptation.....	226
Constituting the Resource: Positive Representations of International Undergraduates	228
Language and Culture: Discourses of Il/Legitimacy	232
 VI DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	241
Discussion of Participant Experiences at UU.....	243
Discussion of Participant Conceptualizations of IHE	263
Discussion of Discourses Within IHE at UU	265
Limitations.....	272
Implications	272
 REFERENCES	277

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Undergraduate Student Participants	94
2. Summary of Study Abroad Preparation and Paths Taken to UU	119
3. Shadowing Schedule	145
4. Lexical Labels Used to Refer to Students	203
5. Binary Oppositions of Lexical Labels Referring to Students	205
6. Researcher's Use of Lexical Labels for Students	211

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Though dissertation research and writing can be lonely work at times, it would be mistaken to think of the work as a solo effort. This dissertation could not have been written without significant contributions from many people over many years. Any thanks I can give here to the people who contributed to this work pale in comparison to what I received from them; nonetheless, I will attempt to put my gratitude into words.

As my advisor and chair of my dissertation supervisory committee, Dr. MaryAnn Christison has been alongside me every step of my 7-year journey at the University of Utah. Her support over the years proved invaluable, striking a perfect balance between giving me the space to explore interests, select a research topic, and develop as a scholar while also being available—always available—as a sounding board for my ideas and providing feedback that was insightful and helpful. She was right there with me during the final weeks of writing, getting feedback to me on my chapter drafts in record time. Not only has she provided support to me over the years, but she has also been a great role model as a teacher, a teacher educator, and a leader. I couldn't have asked for—nor could I imagine—a better chair.

All of the members of my supervisory committee have been very supportive of me and my work over the years, and I am so very grateful to them. Dr. Kathleen Bailey, whom I have known from my days as an MATESOL student at MIIS, is a model teacher, scholar, and administrator from whom I continue to learn. I am so fortunate to have had

her in my life for the past 15 years (and counting). Dr. Amy Bergerson gave me my introduction to critical approaches to leadership in higher education in my very first semester at the University of Utah. I knew from that first semester that I wanted to have her on my committee, and that early instinct has been proven right on multiple occasions. Dr. Johanna Watzinger-Tharp is the very embodiment of an administrator-cum-faculty member working in international education. I have enjoyed my many conversations with her about language and international education and have learned so much from her about leadership and administration in general and about programming, policies, and people at the University of Utah. Finally, it was a pleasure and an honor to work as a TA for Dr. Steven Sternfeld—in no small measure due to our long conversations, which I looked forward to every week. I don't think my committee members could ever know how much they have meant to me over the years, and how much respect and admiration I have for them all.

I am humbled by the generosity of the people who participated in this study. They not only volunteered their time but also gave of themselves in our interviews and conversations. Their contributions to the research are what made this dissertation possible—there quite literally would be no dissertation without their participation. The fact that they are all such kind and interesting individuals is the icing on the cake that made this work especially enjoyable for me. I can only hope that each of these individuals benefitted at least in some small way from their participation.

I am also grateful to the Steffensen Cannon family. I am honored to have been the recipient of a Steffensen Cannon Scholarship for 2 years. The financial support of the scholarship bought me time to devote to my research and to participate more fully in

departmental and campus activities, which in turn enriched my research.

I also need to thank the many friends, family members, and colleagues who have supported and continued to support me over the years. My friends and classmates from the Department of Linguistics and from the Education, Leadership, and Policy and Education, Culture, and Society programs were endless sources of inspiration, stimulating conversations, and much needed occasional distraction. I have learned so much from you all. A special shout-out goes to all my friends from MIIS—particularly MATESOL/MATFL grads from the class of 2002. I love you all so much and thank you for your support and encouragement. I couldn't have made it through those last 4 weeks of writing without you! I also owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Gary Jahn, whom I have known for over 20 years. Had it not been for his belief in a college dropout who returned as a part-time undergraduate student, I would not be completing this doctoral program today. Last but never least, my husband, best friend, and life partner, 胡军. Your support and understanding are as boundless as our love. 我爱你。

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United States is the top receiving nation for globally mobile students in higher education with 231 U.S. campuses each hosting more than 1,000 international students in the 2013–14 academic year (Institute of International Education, 2014, November 17), up from 186 U.S. campuses just 4 years earlier (Institute of International Education, 2010).¹ While U.S. university departments in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (known as the STEM fields) have long played host to many international graduate students, international undergraduate enrollment in the USA overtook graduate student enrollment in 2011–2012 and has remained higher through the most recent reporting period of 2013–2014 (Institute of International Education, 2014). These factors have increased the likelihood, compared to previous decades, that current higher education (HE) faculty will engage with international students from a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

This trend—coupled with the concomitant increase in emphasis on the internationalization of higher education (IHE) in the USA over the last 2 decades—is changing the student makeup of many courses, programs, and departments, leaving many

¹ In this dissertation, I am using the Institute of International Education’s definition of *international student* “as anyone studying at an institution of higher education in the United States on a temporary visa that allows for academic coursework. These include primarily holders of F (student) visas and J (exchange visitor) visas” (Institute of International Education, 2012). I revisit this definition in my examination student subjectivities and of the discursive use of *international student* and *domestic student* in Chapters IV and V.

campuses struggling to adapt simultaneously to the shifting demographic and to the call to prepare students to live and work in an increasingly interconnected, or globalized, society. *Globalization* is characterized, in this context, as the forces (economic, political, social) at work in society that push education towards increased international involvement (Altbach & Knight, 2007). More broadly, globalization can be understood as “a multidimensional set of social processes that create, multiply, stretch, and intensify worldwide social interdependencies and exchanges while at the same time fostering in people a growing awareness of deepening connections between the local and the distant” (Steger, 2003, p. 13).

Two examples—one local and one not—illustrate the high level of interest in preparing students to succeed in a global society. A former university president has called for a global STEM initiative charged with “the preparation of students to become ... citizens informed by global perspectives, uninhibited by global boundaries, prepared to deal with unfamiliar cultures, and willing to be receptive to the contributions that others can make” (Holbrook, 2008, p. 9). Similarly, in a panel session at the 2nd Annual Utah International Higher Education Summit, then Dean of the College of Law and Senior Presidential Adviser on Global Strategy at the University of Utah identified several attributes that he suggested students would need in order to be successful postgraduation, and he argued that these attributes could be developed through international experiences. The attributes included awareness of differences and of the possibility for conflict that comes with contact with difference; empathy and appreciation for diversity resulting from sustained engagement with diverse points of view; and the creativity and entrepreneurship that arise from thinking outside structural assumptions (Chodosh, 2011).

Internationalization of Higher Education

Interest in the internationalization of higher education, reflected in both the language used in university mission statements and an increase in scholarship related to IHE (Kehm & Teichler, 2007), began picking up in the 1980s. The term itself came into common use in the late 1980s; prior to that time, *international education* was the preferred term (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004). However, as Knight and others have noted, internationalization means different things to different people. Depending on one's perspective, it can refer to international activities (such as study abroad programs and international student and faculty exchanges), partnerships, academic programs, and research initiatives; off-shore delivery of education programs; revision of curricula to include international/global/intercultural perspectives; international development projects and trade; or any combination of the above. I will explore definitions and conceptualizations of IHE from the literature in Chapter II.

At the University of Utah (UU), a Research I university that was the site of this study, a presidential task force on internationalization produced a report in May 2006 outlining several recommendations. These recommendations included a goal of increasing international student enrollment to 10% of the student body in 5 years (Presidential Task Force on Internationalization of the University, 2006). Within that time frame, new partnerships and recruiting initiatives led to an increase in international undergraduates at UU.² That increase occurred in the context, noted above, of an overall increase in the number of students coming to the USA from other countries for their undergraduate education, with China in particular leading the way (Institute of

² By Fall 2011, international students comprised about 8.25% of the total student population (University of Utah Office of Budget & Institutional Analysis, 2011).

International Education, November 12, 2012).

Problematizing Internationalization

Many other HE institutions are similarly looking to increase their recruitment and enrollment of international students. This move is often characterized as a win–win–win strategy, mutually beneficial for (1) the international students, who are able to participate in what is often referred to as the best higher education system in the world; (2) the institutions and local economies, for whom the international students are a welcome revenue stream; and (3) the host country national (HCN), or domestic, students, who are assumed to be exposed to diverse cultures, languages, and worldviews as a result of the on-campus presence of students from around the world.

I view this characterization as potentially problematic in several ways. First, the arguable assertion that the U.S. higher education system is the best in the world is often supported by global rankings, such as those produced by the *Times Higher Education Supplement* in the UK, *U.S. News and World Report* in the USA, and the Institute of Higher Education at Shanghai Jiaotong University in China. However, Altbach (2006) concludes that “essentially all of the measures used to assess quality and construct rankings enhance the stature of the large universities in the major English-speaking centers of science and scholarship and especially the United States and the United Kingdom” (p. 3). These contested measures include, for example, both publication and citation counts of faculty publications in established peer-reviewed journals that are included in the Institute for Scientific Information’s Science Citation Index Expanded and Social Science Citation Index, Thomson Reuters’ Web of Science index, and Elsevier’s Scopus. As Altbach notes, “these are mainly journals published in English and

selected with the norms of the major academic systems of the United States and Britain in mind” (p. 3). At issue here is the question of what is recognized as academic knowledge and who is authorized to make that determination. Such a self-supporting system that uses measures that favor the well-established research institutions of the USA and the UK—that is, the very institutions that “occupy and control most of the means and resources of knowledge production” (Lo, 2011, p. 209)—is complicit in imperialism.³

Another problem is the view of international students as revenue generators and as exotic others present on campus for the enrichment of HCN students (Fischer, 2008). Whereas Altbach and Knight (2007) note that “current thinking sees international higher education as a commodity to be freely traded” (p. 291), perhaps it is the international students themselves who are being *commodified*. Their presence allows institutions to designate their campuses as internationalized, and there is concern that they may not be receiving sufficient support or respect in spite of the high fees they pay (Kubota, 2009). In addition, when international students (and their cultures and worldviews) are positioned as objects to be learned about—and, crucially, not learned from—they are othered or exoticized. This, then, amounts to a colonialist practice.⁴ In addition, increases

³ Noting its two prominent meanings, Kumaravadivelu (2006, p. 8) states, “imperialism ... is characterized by the exercise of power either through direct conquest or through political and economic influence that effectively amounts to a similar form of domination.”

⁴ Colonialism—broadly defined (after Kumaravadivelu, 2006) as hegemonic control with or without territorial possession—is implicated in humanism’s subject/object binaries and in the Western Enlightenment drive to “civilize” the “savage” Other. “From the nineteenth century onwards the processes of dehumanization were often hidden behind justifications for imperialism and colonialism which were clothed within an ideology of humanism and liberalism and the assertion of moral claims which related to a concept of civilized ‘man’” (Smith, 1999, p. 26). Dei and Asgharzadeh (2001) describe the colonial process that takes place in higher education:

The process of producing and validating what is knowledge in the academy can be a colonial exercise. Rather than heralding a knowledge that allows learners to develop a counter culture, a colonial process can actually reward the knowledge that inserts learners within existing hegemonic structures and practices. ... [T]he colonization process and colonizing tendencies accede a false

in international student enrollment are not without costs (Cravcenco, 2004).

Finally, all too often, little thought or effort goes into facilitating interaction and learning among university students from diverse backgrounds—perhaps as a result of an assumption that such exchange and learning needs no facilitation. Research in the related fields of diversity and multicultural education, however, has indicated that institutions must move beyond mere structural diversity in order to reap the full potential benefits to learning that multicultural diversity has to offer (e.g., Chang, 2002; Gurin, Day, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002).⁵ It is not at all clear, then, that widespread intercultural learning is taking place at U.S. universities that admit international students.

Issues such as these underline the importance of examining understandings of internationalization on U.S. campuses. How and why are internationalization efforts undertaken? How are they understood? What are their various conceptualizations of IHE and of the role that international students play in campus internationalization efforts? Where do language learning, teaching, and use fit into IHE plans? To what extent do the dominant discourses at U.S. universities confirm or disconfirm the knowledge systems of its international students? These are the kind of questions that can be asked when taking the sort of problematizing stance that informs my approach to this research.

status to the colonial subject through the authority of Western canons at the same time as local knowledges are deprived, negated, and devalued. (299)

⁵ The terms *multicultural* and *diversity* (used together or separately) are used in education to refer to ethnic, racial, linguistic, and other categories of difference among the people (citizens and permanent residents) of a nation. While I am aware of the disciplinary tensions between diversity/multicultural education and IHE, I would argue that many of the concepts and research findings in the former can apply to and enrich understandings of IHE.

Problematizing International Student Support

Within this climate of campus internationalization and increased international student enrollment, concerns regarding the readiness of international students for undergraduate education in the USA have been growing (Fischer, 2011). Intensive English programs (IEPs) have been developing courses and programs targeting new and growing populations of students, particularly from East Asia and the Gulf states,⁶ with many partnerships being formed among IEPs, universities, and private education groups. Examples of these partnerships existed at UU in the form of two Kaplan programs: the Global Pathways Program and the U.S.–Sino Pathway Program. These two conditional admission programs recruited students from overseas for preparation programs at the university that packaged English language and academic culture courses with introductory-level college courses. The programs culminated in admission to the university.

These types of preparation programs generally take a pragmatic approach to helping students learn the skills that U.S. university faculty will expect them to have (Harwood & Hadley, 2004). These skills are useful for students who need or are expected to assimilate into a new context, particularly when the burden of intercultural adjustment falls mainly on the international students.⁷ There is irony, though, in the fact that the very students who are on the one hand expected to contribute to the internationalization of the

⁶ In addition to the increase in students from China noted above, many U.S. institutions have noted significant increases in Saudi students, for example, as a result of a new Saudi government scholarship program (Fischer, 2011).

⁷ This type of approach could be characterized as the “vulgar pragmatic” approach to English for academic purposes (Alastair Pennycook, 1997). “This is pragmatism premised on unreflective acceptance of explicit and implicit standards, conventions, rules, and discourses-practices that we find around us” (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 151). Cherryholmes contrasts *vulgar pragmatism* to *critical pragmatism*, which involves a poststructural questioning (“evaluation and reappraisal,” p. 151) of these standards, rules, practices, etc.

campus through their differences are on the other hand expected to change their behaviors to conform to local norms; there is also evidence in this approach of, once again, colonialism and imperialism. As Kingston and Forland (2008) put it, the “‘cultural providers’ (i.e., universities) allow those alien to the culture to visit, learn from, and ultimately return home invigorated from this new cultural experience” (p. 209), while the hosts remain primarily unchanged by the encounter. The notion that it is only the international students who need support—because they are the only ones who need to learn about and adapt to another culture—does not sit well alongside the vision for university graduates suggested at the panel session at the 2nd Annual Utah International Higher Education Summit described above.

Journey and Orientation to(wards) the Research

I have been involved in language and international education for 20 years. Most recently, before beginning in the PhD program at the University of Utah, I directed programs for a U.S. university in Korea and China, helping prepare students for undergraduate and graduate coursework delivered in English. I developed a concern about the readiness of the Chinese population our program served for undergraduate education in U.S. HE institutions.

After I started in the PhD program, I engaged with readings in critical theories, poststructuralism, and critical applied linguistics while also starting to read the IHE literature. I began to think more critically about intercultural learning, subjectivity, and discourse and took on a problematizing stance with respect to IHE. I eventually came across the report from the UU presidential task force on internationalization, which included among its recommendations goals of increasing both international student

enrollment and participation in study abroad, curricular changes, and the creation of a centralized international institute. It was then that I decided to study IHE at UU with a particular focus on international undergraduate students, a growing yet still comparatively under-researched group.

Drawing on selected goals from the 2006 task force report; the body of literature on IHE; my own interests, experiences, and informal observations at UU; and a developing understanding of my orientation to research, I narrowed my focus further. I decided I wanted to learn more about the experiences of international students, faculty, and staff at an internationalizing university, as well as about their own ideas about internationalization and intercultural learning; how U.S. institutions might construct or position international students; and where views of language learning and use fit into conceptualizations and experiences of IHE.

Situating the Research

Since its beginnings in the postwar years, applied linguistics has undergone a transformation from a subdiscipline concerned with the application of linguistic theory to what some refer to as an interdisciplinary domain that enjoys autonomy from theoretical linguistics. Pennycook (2001) argues for use of the term *antidisciplinary* over *interdisciplinary* for his view of a (post)critical applied linguistics. He describes critical applied linguistics as “*movable praxis* a constantly shifting and dynamic approach to questions of language and education a way of thinking and doing that is always questioning, always seeking new schemas of politicization” (p. 173). In an earlier work, he cautions against viewing applied linguistics as a discipline in light of Foucault’s work on the foundation of disciplines: “It is this process of discipline formation that is crucial

in determining which forms of knowledge are to be valued and upheld and which are to be devalued and discarded” (A. Pennycook, 1994, p. 120). Critical applied linguistics seeks the pluralization of knowledge, not the limitation of it.

Regardless of its inter-, trans-, or antidisciplinary status, work within this domain is interested in language use in a wide range of settings and contexts, including but not limited to language education, and “is not merely the application of linguistic knowledge to such settings but ... draws on but is not dependent on areas such as sociology, education, anthropology, cultural studies, and psychology” (Alastair Pennycook, 2001, p. 3). Its influence has spread inasmuch as discourse and language are foci in many other disciplines and subdisciplines. It is this view of (post)critical applied linguistics that informs the present study.

Previous research into IHE has focused on various dimensions of campus internationalization, such as rationales, programs, services, and curricula; on various populations, including international students, faculty, and administration; and on language.⁸ While many scholars define IHE as a holistic, comprehensive, transformative process (Bartell, 2003; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2004; Mestenhauser, 2002; Olson, 2005; Otten, 2003; Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999), many studies have persisted in measuring institutional internationalization in structural terms (e.g., number of students participating in study abroad, number of international students, number of languages taught) using quantitative methods (M. F. Green, 2005; Horn, Hendel, & Fry, 2007; Theobald, 2008). Other studies of IHE that focus on language or international students have involved a range of approaches. Their subject matter includes monolingualism in IHE (Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008); the implementation and understandings of IHE by

⁸ This and other literature will be discussed more fully in Chapter II.

administrators, faculty, and/or graduate students (Bonfiglio, 1999; Childress, 2007; Cravcenco, 2004; Oka, 2007; Schoorman, 1997, 1999); the acculturation, experiences, or support needs of international students (Bartram, 2008; R. Green, 2010; Y. Zhou, 2010); the “problems” experienced by international students and the HCN faculty that teach them (e.g., Baik & Greig, 2009; Bartram, 2008; Buckridge & Guest, 2007; Fitch & Morgan, 2003; Johnson, 2008; Ransom, Larcombe, & Baik, 2005; Robertson, Line, Jones, & Thomas, 2000; Strauss & U, 2007); IHE and intercultural learning (Stier, 2003); and critical explorations of IHE (De Vita & Case, 2003; Oka, 2007; Stier, 2004).

The above articles and studies have all contributed to understandings of IHE and some of the associated challenges, but very little research has focused exclusively on international undergraduates in the USA—research into international graduate students is much more common. Questions of the subjectivities and positionings of international undergraduates and the role of language/s in IHE have rarely been taken up. There has also been a limited critical focus on the discourses surrounding IHE, international students, and language, although DeVita and Case (2003) and Oka (2007) do take up political issues in IHE, and Stier (2004) investigates conceptualizations of and ideologies in IHE. DeVita and Case (2003) invoke a “broadly Foucauldian perspective on discourse” (p. 383)—that is, acknowledging the productive power of language and discourse—in their critique of IHE in the UK, framing their analysis in terms of a discourse of marketization. Stier (2004) discusses three alternative ideologies of internationalization in what he presents as an attempt to deconstruct the normalized view of the value of internationalization. Both DeVita and Case (2003) and Stier (2004) develop theoretical critiques based on analyses of discourses in the literature and their own experiences;

neither engages in research at an HE institution. Oka (2007) combines the Foucauldian concepts of knowledge and power and the critical notions of ideology and hegemony with an anti-colonial investigation of “both the colonization of knowledge and the academic imperialism of U.S. higher education”(p. 33) in her dissertation research on the “pedagogy of the global”—globalization in higher education and teaching the global—at three universities. Her three areas of focus included the effect of globalization on higher education processes, the promotion of internationalization in higher education, and faculty conceptualizations and teaching of the global. Her research did not include a focus on international students or on university personnel other than faculty. In contrast, I have centered international undergraduate students in my investigation of IHE at UU, which, as detailed below, included participants from several campus constituencies.

The purpose of this study is to explore the perspectives of several individuals on the UU campus with regard to IHE, culturally and linguistically diverse undergraduates, language, and related factors and to reveal the discourses that inform and are informed by those perspectives. I am undertaking to learn about and from my participants’ experiences, ideas, suggestions, frustrations, successes, and so forth, with the belief that these individual and localized stories could inform future policy or practices to improve the learning and experiences of faculty, staff, and students at UU. It is in keeping with my stance to illustrate the importance of recognizing individual differences (Lazarus, 1997) and of not essentializing people based on nationality, ethnicity, or other identity categories.⁹

This research has involved what Pennycook (2001) called “the restive

⁹ Essentializing is a form of stereotyping that attributes characteristics to people based on assumptions about their membership in specific socioculturally defined groups, such as ethnicity, nationality, race, or gender.

problematization of the given” (p. 107): questioning given categories and binaries (e.g., international student/domestic student, native speaker/non-native speaker) and discourses and exploring how they are “products of particular cultural and historical ways of thinking” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 107). This problematizing stance also extends to my own assumptions, biases, use of language, analyses, and knowledge constructions.¹⁰

To achieve my purpose, in this qualitative study I aim at taking a postcritical approach informed by critical applied linguistics—“a shifting and critical way of thinking about questions to do with language” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 136). Within this framework of posts, I have taken up several challenges identified by Pennycook (2001):

the postcolonial challenge of dealing with the Other, the poststructuralist requirement to understand how discourses operate across multiple sites, constructing our worlds and subjectivities, and the postmodern challenge to deal with the particularities and complexities presented by trying to take differences seriously. (p. 140)

In my approach, therefore, I attempt both to understand the conceptualizations and experiences of internationalization among university administrators, faculty, staff, and students and to trace the power and the discourses that shape and are shaped by their conceptualizations. I seek to identify the discourses that contribute to the positioning and subjectivities of international students and explore the ways in which these students negotiate those discourses, taking up and rejecting various *subject positions*, defined as possible identities constructed through discourse (Edley, 2001). This notion comes from a poststructural view of identity that acknowledges the power of discourse and its effect on the way we make sense of the world and ourselves and others in it.

Although it has been variously conceived and defined, the tendency among scholars is to locate discourse “between the linguistic and the social” (Rogers, 2011, p. 6).

¹⁰ I will address self-reflexivity at length in Chapter III.

In its most basic linguistic sense, the term *discourse* has been used to refer to (communicative) language use (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 2). My use of the term in this study is much closer to Morgan's (2007) definition. He states that discourses are "systems of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1982) that regulate and assign value to all forms of semiotic activity for instance, oral/written texts, gestures, images, spaces, and their multimodal integration" (Morgan, 2007, p. 952). I further discuss my understanding of discourse, and my approach to discourse analysis, in Chapter III.

Research Questions

I take an exploratory stance in this study in that I aim to explore experiences of individual participants, their conceptualizations of IHE, and the discourses that constitute and are constituted by their perspectives. Additionally, I refer to this research as *exploratory* because I started with very broad questions that narrowed over time and I also identify topics and questions to take up in future studies. The research questions that I eventually arrived at are as follows:

1. How do study participants describe their experiences as UU students, faculty, administrators, and staff in a culturally and linguistically diverse university context? What dilemmas are evident in those experiences?
2. How do participants conceive of the internationalization of higher education? How do they see internationalization playing out at UU?
3. What are the discourses that help shape and are shaped by the participants' conceptualizations and experiences of IHE?
 - a. What subjectivities are ascribed to, taken up by, and resisted by the international undergraduate participants at UU?

b. How is language talked about and used among the participants at UU?

The research was conducted at the University of Utah from late 2012 to late 2014, following IRB approval in the fall of 2012. It involved document analysis; interviews with administrators, faculty, staff, and international undergraduates; and observations. More details of my methods are presented in Chapter III following a review of the literature in Chapter II. I present my findings with respect to the first two research questions in Chapter IV and the third question in Chapter V. In Chapter VI, I discuss those results and offer recommendations based on my interpretations.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE ON INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Internationalization of Higher Education (IHE)

The purpose of this chapter is to situate my research with respect to the research on the internationalization of higher education (IHE). In this review of the literature on IHE, I begin by examining several of the definitions and conceptual frameworks in use. I also note the connections between diversity in higher education (HE) and IHE. Next I discuss internationalization of curricula, including the role of language and culture teaching and learning in IHE, followed by the role of and support for international students and scholars on U.S. campuses. These topics are illustrated by examples of internationalization initiatives at HE campuses drawn from the literature. I then address some of the constraints HE institutions face and some of the deficiencies that have been noted in the practice of IHE. Finally, I end with a few critical studies of IHE and international students. Through these conversations I identify and stake out a space for my research.

Conceptualizing IHE: Definitions, Rationales, and Frameworks

The definitions and conceptual frameworks of IHE used in the literature range from less to more process-oriented views. The former focus on quantifiable activities,

programs, and so forth, whereas the latter approaches see IHE more as a philosophy of education or a value system that emerges organically from the evolving mission of a given institution. The differing approaches share some concerns: They all caution that merely talking about IHE (e.g., in institutional mission statements) is not sufficient for internationalization, and they note the low participation rate of U.S. students in study abroad programs necessitating other approaches to IHE than just student mobility. A sampling of the definitions and approaches in the literature is presented in this section.

Definitions of IHE. Knight (2004) traces the evolution of the term *internationalization* from the late 1980s, when it was used to refer to a set of activities, such as study abroad and exchange programs, academic programs, international research and development initiatives, and so forth, occurring at the institutional level. In the mid-1990s, a conceptual shift was evident as internationalization began to be seen as a process. Later that decade there was a broadening of the concept from the institutional level to include responses to effects of globalization (i.e., responses to external forces). Knight cites a 2002 definition that focused on holistic change processes undertaken by institutions to enhance quality and improve outcomes (Soderqvist, as cited in Knight, 2004). She updated her own definition to take into account both the institutional and the national/sector levels involved in IHE: “Internationalization at the national/sector/institutional levels is the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of higher education at the institutional and national levels” (Knight, 2008, p. 21). Knight has noted elsewhere the relationship between globalization and internationalization, with *globalization* characterized as the forces (economic, political, social) at work in society

that push education towards increased international involvement (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2008). In addition to these societal forces, contextual factors such as national policies related to IHE; the institution's mission, vision, and values; institutional stakeholders, including domestic and international students; and the institution's rationale for internationalization help to shape any given HE institution's approach to internationalization.

Other definitions from the same period continue to emphasize process, including a focus on the multidimensionality of the process leading to an international mindset (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999) and a philosophical view: "Comprehensive internationalization is a philosophy rather than a policy, a process rather than a set of activities, a journey rather than a destination" (Olson, 2005, p. 53). Many highlight the transformational nature of IHE as a change process (e.g., Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Ellingboe, as cited in Bartell, 2003; Otten, 2003). These definitions all stand in contrast to traditional views of international education, which conceived of it as a collection of programs and activities, often externally driven (e.g., through government funding) and not arising organically from a philosophy or value set.

One of the respected scholars in the field, Mestenhauser (2002) continues to use the term *international education*, which he differentiates from *internationalization* as follows: *International education* consists of the kinds of things that HE institutions report doing. It is

a field of inquiry and application associated with institutions of higher education whose curricular and non-curricular programs are designed to impart knowledge, skills and understanding of interrelationships among individuals, institutions, nations, and multinational as well as transnational organizations. (Mestenhauser, 2002, p. 169)

Evidence of international education at HE institutions can be found, Mestenhauser states, in their course catalogues, policy documents, promotional materials, and individual and institutional memberships and activity in professional and academic associations. *IHE*, on the other hand, is “a program of educational change and reform that needs to happen if our educational institutions are to respond to the dramatic changes in the world of today” (Mestenhauser, 2002, p. 169). His view, then, is that while many HE institutions are engaged in international education activities, they (and the HE system in general) fall short of IHE.

Working within a critical pedagogy framework that is centered on the notion of hegemony (i.e., “patterns of underrepresentation, cultural marginalization, and dominance of nations, culture, and perspectives over the interests of the less powerful” [Schoorman, 1999, p. 20]), Schoorman (1999) arrives at the following definition of IHE:

Internationalization is an ongoing, counterhegemonic education process that occurs in an international context of knowledge and practice where societies are viewed as subsystems of a larger, inclusive world. The process of internationalization at an educational institution entails a comprehensive, multifaceted program of action that is integrated into all aspects of education. (p. 21)

Schoorman clearly views IHE as a transformational process, but with the addition of a counterhegemonic purpose she adds an emancipatory goal that is not evident in other formal definitions.

Internationalization at home. In their drive to internationalize, many institutions include targets for numbers of U.S. students participating in study abroad programs. Despite those institutional goals, the numbers of U.S. students studying abroad have remained low, at 1.5% of all U.S. students in higher education studying abroad in 2012–2013 compared to international students making up 3.9% of all students in U.S.

higher education during the same period (Institute of International Education, 2014). The realization that many students cannot or will not study abroad, and an understanding that student mobility is not the only facet to IHE, led to the development of a movement called *internationalization at home* (IaH), with a strong emphasis on cultural diversity in teaching and learning (Wächter, 2003). *IaH* has been defined as “the provision by universities of international and intercultural learning opportunities for those students who for various reasons do not participate in study-abroad programs” (Paige, 2003, p. 52). Whether institutions choose this type of internationalization will depend, in part, on their rationale for internationalizing their campuses.

Rationales for IHE. Motivations for IHE are many and varied. Contextual factors, including the size, classification (e.g., 2-year community college, 4-year liberal arts college, or research university), and mission of an institution, contribute to its rationale for internationalizing. Rationales for IHE have tended to be grouped into four broad categories: political, economic, sociocultural, and academic (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004). Knight (2008) has proposed another approach to categorizing emerging rationales into those at the national and institutional levels. I address each of these categories in turn.

Political rationales. Foreign policy and national security concerns are often cited among the political rationales. The post-WWII cold-war years saw an increased interest in international education in the name of national security. Title VI of the National Defense Education Act, the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship, and the Fulbright Act all came into being during this period (Horn et al., 2007).¹¹ The current post-9/11 period has seen mixed results with regard to government-sponsored programs,

¹¹ Funding for the Fulbright program was cut by 20% in the 1990s (Altbach, 2006).

as can be seen in Edwards, Lenker, and Kahn's (2008-2009) review of national language programs and legislation.

Enhancing peace and mutual understanding is another political rationale that can either coincide or conflict with foreign policy rationales (de Wit, 2002; Mestenhauser, 2002). Mestenhauser characterizes this political rationale as one of the larger goals of IHE that can only be achieved if internationalization is integrated into "the entire theory and practice of education" (p. 171). Other political rationales include technical assistance and national or regional identity.

Economic rationales. Increasing enrollment by recruiting international students can serve as a financial incentive for both for-profit and nonprofit institutions (see, e.g., Altbach & Knight, 2007; Hughes, 2008; Knight, 2004). Most public U.S. institutions charge international students out-of-state or nonresident tuition rates (Hughes, 2008), while less than a quarter of international students in 2009–2010 (in spite of a 9% increase over the previous year) were funded primarily by the U.S. institutions they attended (Institute of International Education, 2011). Thus, a great deal of revenue can be generated from full-fee-paying international students. The commercialization of international education was remarked upon in the keynote address at a *Universities UK* conference in 2004: "The presence of international students and faculty is no longer an optional, mildly exotic, welcome ingredient of campus life. It is quite simply what makes it possible for the academic enterprise to continue" (Crewe, as cited in Hughes, 2008, p. 112). Economic growth and competitiveness and the labor market are other commonly cited economic rationales.

Socio-cultural rationales. National cultural identity, citizenship development,

and social and community development are all cited in the literature (Knight, 2004), but the most commonly noted socio-cultural rationale is intercultural understanding (see, e.g., Hughes, 2008; Otten, 2003; Paige, 2003; Teekens, 2003). Teekens notes that the cognitive and affective goals of IaH both contribute to the development of intercultural competence.

Academic rationales. In his book on IHE, de Wit (2002) describes several interrelated academic rationales, including an international dimension to teaching and learning, extended academic horizons, and institution building. These three areas are all related to the expansion of ideas and knowledge by seeking them—and then disseminating and applying them—from other countries and cultures. de Wit also mentions enhancement of quality and international academic standards.

Emerging rationales. Knight (2004, 2008) identified several national and institutional rationales that seemed to defy categorization, as they cut across several or all four of the groups listed above. Examples of these other rationales include, at the national level, nation building, commercial trade, human resource development, strategic alliances, and social/cultural development and mutual understanding; and at the institutional level, international branding and profile, student and staff development, knowledge production, quality enhancement/international standards, income generation, and strategic alliances.

Regardless of which rationale(s) motivate(s) an institution's internationalization, it is vital that HE institutions (and other bodies) be clear about their rationales for internationalization as these rationales, in concert with institutional values and mission, should be closely linked to—and guide the development of—approaches to internationalization (Knight, 2004, 2008). Approaches can again be divided into the

sector (national or regional) level and the institutional level. At the sector level, approaches to internationalization may be ad hoc (i.e., purely reactive), or they may be seen or described in terms of programs, rationales, policies, or strategies. Approaches at the institutional level may be conceived of in terms of any combination of the following: activities, outcomes, rationales, processes, campus culture, and overseas or cross-border delivery. The approaches are neither fixed nor mutually exclusive.

In the IHE literature, researchers have examined different aspects of internationalization with different levels of focus (e.g., the national level, the institutional level, or comparisons of institutions). Some have looked at individual institutions in terms of their rationales or approaches or both, while others, as seen above, have created taxonomies of rationales and approaches. In the next section, I will introduce some of the conceptual frameworks that have been used to investigate and evaluate the internationalization of higher education institutions.

Conceptual frameworks. Notwithstanding the focus on process evident in many of the definitions of IHE, many of the evaluation rubrics and conceptual frameworks for IHE seem to be based on easily observable and quantifiable aspects—that is, on the traditional activities view of international education. In this section, I discuss several frameworks that I have grouped into two broad categories: those that are more structural—that is, that focus on quantifiable indicators—in their approach, and those that are more holistic or process-oriented—that is, that focus on change, learning, and interactions among components of the process.

Structural focus. Many scholars working with what I have termed a structural focus have proposed frameworks or typologies of indicators of IHE. These indicators

address such areas as the curriculum, students and scholars, research, and institutional support for internationalization. Typically, application of the frameworks yields quantitative data that purportedly reveal the degree of internationalization of a given institution. Institutions can then be compared or ranked according to their internationalization scores (M. F. Green, 2005; Horn et al., 2007; Theobald, 2008). Although they use Mestenhauser's (2002) systems-based view (see below) as a starting point, Horn et al. (2007) limit their framework to areas with publicly available and quantifiable data, proposing 19 total indicators comprising five categories. The internationalization index developed by the American Council on Education (ACE) includes six dimensions (M. F. Green, 2005). NAFSA includes both quantifiable indicators, similar to those put forth in Horn et al. (2007) and Green (2005), and an evaluative indicator—demonstrable effects on students and faculty (Schock, 2007)—in their criteria for determining the extent of internationalization of an HE institution.

Process focus. Others hold a more *process*-oriented view of IHE, as opposed to the traditional view as a set of programs or activities (Bartell, 2003; Knight, 2004; Olson, 2005; Paige, 2003). In their concept of IHE, Paige and Mestenhauser (1999) emphasize learning as a process and have metacognitive and epistemological concerns: how people organize their thinking, interpret or understand their experiences, and make sense of the world. This learning, they say, may be ethnocentric or ethnorelative. One of the goals, then, of IHE is to promote ethnorelative learning, which involves “acceptance of, adaptation to, and integration of cultural differences into our thinking and behavior” (p. 504).

Olson (2005) calls for a holistic and intentional approach by HE leaders towards internationalizing their campuses, enabling them to be better poised to take advantage of external opportunities that align with their institutions' mission and vision. She cites two ACE reports that developed a theory or model of change and applied it to IHE. The model accounts for four types of change (namely, adjustments, isolated change, far-reaching change, and transformational change) with values along two dimensions: depth and breadth. The type of change with the greatest depth and breadth is transformational change, which is the type called for by advocates of comprehensive internationalization (Engberg & Green, 2002; Green & Olson, 2003, as cited in Olson, 2005).

Transformational change is systemic rather than additive, such that change in one policy or practice triggers changes in others. Olson gives the example of curricular internationalization, which, in a transformative model, could be connected to changes in faculty development, reward structures, and interdisciplinary practices.

Two models that have been developed as a result of dissertation research conceptualize the campus internationalization process as a series of phases that institutions pass through. Knight (1994, as cited in Childress, 2007) proposes a nonlinear cycle that includes six phases: (a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement (p. 117). Cravcenco (2004) identified stages of internationalization that develop alongside purposes, strategies, priorities, and policies. The stages in her model progress linearly, from initiation through development, maintenance, redefinition, and restructuring.

The process-oriented view also sees IHE as continually evolving, which can make it a tough sell in the current atmosphere of accountability. "Comprehensive

internationalization as a journey rather than a destination can be a challenging principle to grasp. Many want to know ‘Are we there yet?’ or ‘When can we proclaim that we are a fully internationalized institutions [sic]?’” (Olson, 2005, p. 55). However, there can be no end state to a process that must adapt to an ever-changing student body living in an ever-changing world (Paige, 2003).

Mestenhauser’s (2002) systems theory–based approach combines several indicators with different perspectives and examines the connections among them. He derived seven indicators or learning domains in which international education takes place from the literature over the previous 50 years and five perspectives from both systems theory and the international education literature. The learning domains are international studies/relations; area studies; foreign languages; international dimensions of academic disciplines; educational exchanges of students and scholars; development contracts and interuniversity agreements; and organization, administration, policy, governance and financing. The five perspectives are (1) the stakeholders and constituents: individuals (e.g., students and faculty) or institutions (e.g., employers, governments, or foundations); (2) the scope of international education (e.g., single country, cross-national research, regional, global perspective, inclusion of one’s own country; what needs to be added to make it international education—perspectives about knowledge, learning, and teaching); (3) education (learning and teaching); (4) the context in which international education functions; and (5) meta-knowledge about knowledge of international education: the character of the field and its culture. These perspectives act as the lenses through which international education can be viewed.

Within the transformational process–based conceptualizations of IHE, accurately

measuring the level of IHE at any given institution would be a lengthy and complex process (assuming it were even definable and measurable). Nonetheless, it is striking that both types of frameworks outlined above have comparatively little to say about the implementation of IHE in terms of qualitative description—experiential or phenomenological (i.e., how the various players experience IHE efforts)—and its effect on various campus populations. Particularly puzzling is the lengths that Horn et al. (2007) go to in order to describe their process-oriented view of IHE only then to reduce internationalization to easily observable quantifiable indicators. As both a researcher and an educator interested in IHE, I do not want to know only, for example, the number of foreign language courses offered, the number of courses dealing with international issues or with a global perspective, and whether students are required to take such courses. I think it is important to try to gain an understanding of what goes on in those courses: what the objectives are and how they were derived, what the teachers do, what materials and approaches are used, what the students do (not just what they are being taught or exposed to, but what their experiences and understandings are), and so forth. These sorts of questions cannot be answered either through a quantitative approach or quickly and easily on a large scale. There is a great need for more research in this area.

IHE and diversity. Diversity issues in education relate to intracultural or intranational diversity (e.g., diversity in terms of ethnicity, race, gender, and sexuality), whereas international education and IHE deal with intercultural (in addition to intranational) diversity. Although the scope is different, there are parallels between diversity in HE and IHE. A familiarity with some of the discussions and research in diversity can be enlightening for those working in IHE.

As is the case with *internationalization*, the term *diversity* is understood in different ways, even within the context of higher education. For example, Gurin, Day, Hurtado, and Gurin (2002) outline three types of diversity in postsecondary institutions and four areas of research into the impact of diversity on higher education. Urciuoli (1999, 2000, 2003, 2009, 2010) has researched and written about the discursive construction of diversity and multiculturalism in higher education. Chang (2002) presents two discourses supporting diversity in higher education and cites other research listing several dimensions of postsecondary institutions that need to be taken into account for diversity initiatives to have positive educational outcomes (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999; Smith et al., 1997, both as cited in Chang, 2002).

The three ways that postsecondary institutions expose students to racial and ethnic diversity, or three types of diversity, that Gurin et al. (2002) outline are (a) *structural diversity*, which refers simply to the numbers of students from different racial and ethnic groups; (b) *informal interactional diversity*, which refers to the frequency and quality of intergroup interaction occurring outside classrooms; and (c) *classroom diversity*, which includes both learning about diverse peoples (content knowledge) and interacting with diverse peers in class. These authors claim that structural diversity is a necessary but not sufficient condition for achieving maximum educational benefit, and their research bore out this claim.

Urciuoli, a linguistic anthropologist, employs a natural histories of discourse (Silverstein & Urban, 1996) approach to critical discourse analysis in her research into discourses of diversity and multiculturalism in higher education. Her approach involves tracing the use of the terms *diversity* and *multicultural* in several fields of discourse

within an HE institution. Using Bourdieu's (1991, as cited in Urciuoli, 1999) notion of *fields of discourse* as "fields of social relations each with their characteristic discourse forms, sets of expectations and linguistic markets" (p. 297), Urciuoli (1999) notes the pragmatic dissonance of apparently identical referents (*diversity*, *diverse*, *multiculturalism*, and *multicultural*) across these fields. The fields of discourse she examined include administration, admissions, communications and development, student life, and academic/faculty (Urciuoli, 1999, 2003, 2010). In her later work, Urciuoli (2010) examines the diversity discourses in relation to the neoliberal discourse in higher education.

Among her findings, Urciuoli (1999, 2010) notes a large degree of incongruence between conceptualizations of diversity and multiculturalism held by offices of admissions and of communications and development and those held by faculty and by student multicultural organizations. These differences, she emphasizes, can be obscured when references to diversity are entextualized. Following Silverstein and Urban (1996), Urciuoli (2010) defines *entextualization* as

a process by which bits of discourse are perceived and treated as units separate from the processes through which they were produced. They come to seem autonomous, operating as free floating encapsulations of what social actors take as shared, transmittable meaning that circulate in written and spoken form across social boundaries. Such circulation perpetuates among social actors the sense that in some important way 'the same thing'—the same information, the same piece of culture—is being transmitted. (p. 49)

The differences in conceptualizations are further obscured, she notes, when there is broad agreement across discursive fields that diversity is a good thing and a lack of diversity in the institution must be redressed. The term *diversity*, then, becomes what she calls a *strategically deployable shifter* (SDS) (Urciuoli, 1999, 2003, 2010). Two important

characteristics of SDSs include the shifting nature of “key elements of signification ... depending on the relationship, aims, and field in which an SDS is deployed” and the fact that they “can be deployed to particular ends” (Urciuoli, 1999, p. 289). One consequence of the entextualization of *diversity* and its function as an SDS is that individuals from different discursive fields end up talking past one another:

Everyone involved operates in response to diversity as an entextualized unit: that it is ‘the same’ form, complete in and of itself, with ‘the same’ referents no matter who uses it in what role to what end. So pragmatic incoherence—‘misunderstanding’—is as unavoidable as it is unnoticed. (Urciuoli, 2010, p. 56)

In his work on international education in Australia, Liddicoat (2004, as cited in Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008) similarly identifies different ways that higher education institutions construct *internationalization*: internationalization of the student body (international recruitment), internationalization of student experience (student mobility), and internationalization of the curriculum. These three approaches are informed by different rationales and assumptions, which are masked by the use of the unmodified term *internationalization*.

Chang (2002) offers another critical treatment of diversity in higher education. He argues that some proponents of diversity have an oversimplified view of what it takes to create a diverse campus that will lead to positive learning outcomes, overlooking key factors in that process. The danger of this oversimplification is that it may “undermine the educational impact of diversity” (p. 126). He describes a discourse of preservation that supports diversity with current methods, such as allowing the consideration of race and ethnicity in admissions, yet still has shortcomings. He identifies four: First, it overlooks the historical development of diversity efforts. Chang offers a few different views of diversity in HE, some narrowly structural and others more wide-ranging. He

notes that diversity efforts often started around equitable access and representation in HE for students of color, but that other issues, including gender equity as well as retention and graduation rates, were raised over time. Second, the discourse of preservation narrowly focuses on admissions as the main goal of diversity efforts:

Widespread educational benefits associated with diversity tend to emerge from a well-coordinated set of diversity-related efforts that effect change in multiple levels of the campus environment. ... Few studies ... show that simply admitting a racially diverse group of students without complementing this practice with other diversity-related activities necessarily fosters educational benefits. (p. 130)

Chang cites other research (and reviews of research) that has demonstrated the importance of efforts that go beyond a focus on admissions. Hurtado et al. (1999, as cited in Chang, 2002) identified four dimensions of HE institutions that need to be taken into account as the institutions work towards the goal of improving the climate for racial and cultural diversity: historical (institutional legacy of inclusion/exclusion), structural (representation of, e.g., people of color among students, faculty, staff, administration), psychological (attitudes, perceptions, etc.), and behavioral (interracial contact, multicultural programs, changes to curricula, etc). Smith et al. (1997, as cited in Chang, 2002) identified three dimensions: “(a) the inclusion and success of previously underrepresented groups, (b) the prevention of an overall ‘chilly’ campus environment, and (c) the inclusion of diverse traditions in the curriculum, pedagogy, and scholarly inquiry” (Chang, 2002, p. 131). These views bear some resemblance to the Gurin et al. (2002) account of the limitations of structural diversity.

The third shortcoming of the discourse of preservation is that it ignores the transformative aims of the promotion of diversity. And fourth, it underestimates the impact diversity can have on student learning. Diversity efforts need to question

assumptions about learning. Critics of diversity often base their arguments in two areas: (1) what students should learn (the canonical knowledge typically drawn from White, Western males) and (2) who is qualified to learn (related to the meritocracy myth). Chang (2002) argues in favor of a transformative discourse—one that recognizes and resolves the shortcomings of the discourse of preservation. It asks critical questions, such as “Who deserves an opportunity to learn? How is the potential for learning evaluated? What is learned? Who oversees learning? What conditions advance learning for all students?” (Chang, 2002, p. 134).

Transformation has been called for both in diversity initiatives and in efforts at internationalization, and the arguments in these two areas overlap. The Gurin et al. (2002) findings, noted above, were consistent with earlier research that has indicated that institutions must move beyond mere structural diversity in order to reap the full potential benefits to learning. Chang (2002) provides a more detailed account of the types of changes that need to be made to promote diversity. He notes the need to provide fair access to educational opportunities and to expand curricula to include more than just the dominant, mainstream Western view of knowledge and history. Comprehensive efforts at IHE are likewise concerned with more than just structural matters such as the number of international students on campus or the number of languages taught. Nor is having an articulated commitment to IHE sufficient: The 2001 ACE survey of 144 research universities found that there was often no correlation between such formal statements and other efforts at internationalization (M. F. Green, 2005). At the heart of IHE are considerations of language, culture, and internationalization of the curriculum in order to make it more accessible to all students on campus and more inclusive of diverse

perspectives. Faculty engagement in internationalization of the curriculum plays a key role in these areas and is the topic of the next section.

Curricular Innovation and Faculty Involvement in IHE

In her dissertation research, Childress highlights the role of faculty in IHE by studying faculty involvement in internationalization at two U.S. universities (Childress, 2007). Internationalization of curricula is just one way that faculty can be involved. Referring to Knight's (1994, as cited in Childress, 2007) internationalization cycle, Childress designed her study to investigate the transition from the planning phase to the operationalization phase of that cycle; she presents a model she developed for understanding how the two universities operationalized faculty engagement. The five components of Childress's (2007) model, which she calls "The Five I's of Faculty Engagement in Internationalization," are (1) intentionality (as seen in the articulation of internationalization goals), (2) investments (in resources for faculty engagement), (3) infrastructure (programming in the form of academic activities and organizational practices providing opportunities for faculty to explore international perspectives in teaching and research), (4) institutional networks (web portals and databases, campus-wide committees, and international centers that act as communication channels), and (5) individual support (to connect institutional goals with individual research and practice). She characterizes this model as cybernetic, and represents it in a Venn diagram with five overlapping loops, to underscore the fact that "this faculty engagement framework emphasizes the interconnectivity among institutional sub-systems, feedback loops, and stakeholders" (Childress, 2007, p. 306). Childress also developed a typology of strategies for faculty engagement that combined the type of strategy used (teaching, research, or

service) with the location (on campus, regional, or abroad).

As is the case with IHE in general, curriculum internationalization is a long-term, multidimensional transformational process with multifaceted approaches (Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws, Van Gyn, & Preece, 2007; Van Gyn, Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws, & Preece, 2009). However, the investments that institutions make in this process—which Childress (2007) identified as an integral component of her engagement model—have been found to be lacking. Bonfiglio (1999) identifies five reasons that HE institutions have largely not been able to realize wholesale internationalization of curricula: (1) shifting and competing purposes and directions of international education (e.g., foreign policy studies, peace education, international exchange programs), depending on the political and economic climate, that inhibit comprehensive curricular reform; (2) governmental constraints (often tied to funding) influencing change from outside the university; (3) institutional structures that block change (e.g., resources funneled into study abroad or other international programming at the expense of curricular change); (4) theoretical assumptions underlying the American undergraduate curriculum, which are at odds with perspectives that allow for multiple, shifting, diverse, and competing forms of knowledge; and (5) a lack of research and data to support internationalization of curricula.

In research related to Bonfiglio’s (1999) third reason, an ACE report found that it was more likely for faculty to receive funding to participate in international activities than for institutions to fund on-campus workshops aimed at helping them internationalize their curricula (Green, 2005). It seems, then, as though institutions are “outsourcing” some of their responsibility to promote internationalization. The same trend can be observed with the greater emphasis many institutions place on setting targets for student

participation in study abroad programs than on efforts to internationalize at home. There is, however, a developing body of literature devoted to curricular internationalization in a range of HE contexts (see, e.g., Guerin, 2009; M. Haigh, 2009; M. J. Haigh, 2002; Jackson, 2003; Joseph, 2008; Kahane, 2009; Schmied & Shiba, 2007; Schuerholz-Lehr et al., 2007; Vainio-Mattila, 2009; Van Gyn et al., 2009; Wang, 2010).

Schuerholz-Lehr et al. (2007) and Van Gyn et al. (2009) report on a pilot program at the University of Victoria in British Columbia—a 5-day workshop offered to help faculty internationalize their courses. Taking a transformative learning approach, the workshop facilitators helped participants examine and reflect on their assumptions as they guided them through the course redesign process. The participants came to the conclusion that internationalizing their courses entailed neither merely an additive approach (tacking on an international element or module) nor catering to the needs of only the international students in their classes. Rather, they discovered that they needed to integrate international perspectives into the entire course and that, by adopting a student-centered approach that considered student needs and backgrounds, all students would benefit. This finding supports Zamel's (1995) assertion that the work that faculty need to do to promote the learning of ESL students—in that it requires a reflective approach to teaching; thinking about expectations, objectives, assignments, and assessment; and an awareness of the values and assumptions underlying teaching and scholarship—will benefit all students.

What faculty ought to be doing to enhance the learning of ESL students is *not* a concession, a capitulation, a giving up of standards—since the unrevised approaches that some faculty want to retain may never have been beneficial for *any* students. (Zamel, 1995, p. 518)

Other aspects of the curriculum, including materials and pedagogical approaches,

also need to be examined. In spite of the Canadian example Schuerholz-Lehr et al. (2007) report on, DeVita and Case (2003) note that additive (“infusion”) approaches to curriculum internationalization remain common in the UK and the USA. They critique this approach for limitations in views of learning and knowledge. Learning is viewed in terms of discrete bits of content—a perspective that masks complexity. “It builds on a reductionist and exclusively cognitive western learning philosophy” (p. 388). Learning is also viewed within a knowledge dissemination model, which ignores the importance of both experiential learning and the social aspects of intercultural learning. “[Intercultural learning] entails the discovery and transcendence of difference through authentic experiences of cross-cultural interaction that involve real tasks, and emotional as well as intellectual participation” (p. 388).

Additionally, De Vita and Case (2003) argue that the source of knowledge commonly infused into the curriculum can be problematic. Textbooks can betray linguistic and cultural biases—even putatively “international” texts often focus only on the discipline as practiced in English-speaking countries (De Vita & Case, 2003; Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008). The danger of relying on materials developed from an Anglo/Western point of view is a “monocultural model of internationalisation ... disseminating unreflexively ethnocentric views or ... engaging in a form of ideological manipulation through the promotion of ‘western packaged global problems and seemingly global solutions’” (Anyanwu, 1998, as cited in DeVita & Case, 2003, p. 389).

DeVita and Case cite Ryan’s (2000) report of complaints from international students that “their courses offer an almost exclusively anglocentric view in some areas of study, and that this view is presented as if it were universal” (p. 389). The researchers

found that even when students state that what they are learning in class will not be applicable to their home contexts, they are largely ignored. This last point particularly raises questions regarding to what extent the worldviews of these international students—touted as contributing to the internationalization of the campus and intercultural learning of host country national (HCN) students—are actually being heard (or even recognized) and valued.

An alternative to the additive approach to curricular internationalization critiqued by DeVita and Case (2003) might be to start from a non-Western pedagogical approach, an ethnorelative move that could allow students and faculty to learn from and not just about other cultures (Miike, 2015). Kahane (2009) recommends a contemplative pedagogy with roots in many Eastern spiritual traditions. Haigh (2009) suggests a three-level Sattvic curriculum focused on self-development. The levels map easily onto recognizable components already present (to a greater or lesser degree) in Western HE curricula, as follows:

- Level 1 is motivational and involves learners in overcoming surface-based learning.
- Level 2 is devoted to building skills, experience, and self-confidence as learners are engaged in exploration, problem solving, and other creative learning activities.
- Level 3 is reflective and involves perspective taking, self-awareness, and the development of empathy.

It is notable that the mindfulness, self-awareness, and empathy advocated by Kahane (2009) and Haigh (2009) are also key components to intercultural competence advanced

by Bennett (1998) and others (e.g., Caliguri, 2000; Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1979; Stone, 2006; Ting-Toomey, 2012).

With respect to language support curricula for international students (and others for whom English is an additional language), it may be an issue when texts written specifically for international students present academic discourses and conventions as neutral and apolitical. Critical pragmatism, which involves a continuous (re-)evaluation of norms, standards, beliefs, and assumptions (Cherryholmes, 1988, as cited in Capper, 1998), calls into question the assumption that international students must/will adapt to U.S. cultural and linguistic standards in HE. It also recognizes that academic conventions such as rhetorical styles are not neutral, value-free, or inherently worthy of perpetuation and imitation (Harwood & Hadley, 2004). Critical pragmatic English for academic purposes (EAP), for example, attempts to strike a balance between pragmatic and critical approaches to teaching writing: It questions norms and conventions, making room for diversity, yet also promotes access to discourse communities. However, as Lather (1992, as cited in Harwood & Hadley, 2004) notes, practitioners of critical pragmatism need to guard against the (neo)colonial or paternalistic approach that would simply replace one oppressive pedagogy with another: “The supposedly empowering practices of critical pedagogy can consist of enlightened practitioners ‘liberating’ their students from the shackles of normativity in a manner which also constructs students as passive receivers in an unequal relationship” (p. 365).

The curricular changes that HE institutions initiate will depend on their rationale(s) for internationalization and be shaped by underlying assumptions and biases. These assumptions may reflect an ethnocentric stance in direct conflict with the global outlook

promoted in a mission statement, or they may issue from an ethnorelative view. An institution's orientation to language will also affect the curriculum and broader campus culture. An institution may cultivate a more or less monolingual culture, it may relegate the use of languages other than English to foreign language classrooms, or it may promote multilingualism. As seen in the next section, some approaches to curricular internationalization do focus specifically on the role of languages and intercultural learning.

Role of language in internationalization. A recent issue of the *Modern Language Journal* included a forum on the role of language departments in internationalizing curricula (Byrnes, 2009). The editor noted that, on the one hand, it seemed obvious that language faculty would play a role in IHE, but, on the other hand, it was not entirely clear what that role should or could be. Some of the issues discussed included language learning requirements and increased opportunities for students to use the languages they were learning. There seems to be a broad consensus among the forum contributors that fewer American students are studying foreign languages now than a few decades ago and that the perceived need to learn languages has paradoxically (in view of the omnipresent discourses of globalization and internationalization) decreased (Byrnes, 2009; Goodman, 2009; Kubota, 2009; Straight, 2009; Strong, 2009). The contributors also call for measures that will integrate the learning and use of foreign languages into the curriculum.

While those working in foreign language (FL) and international education see the value in language study, they note that FL requirements for students in HE have changed over the years. Graduate students used to learn additional languages to gain access to

publications in languages other than English (LOTE), but now researchers around the world are increasingly publishing in English (Kubota, 2009; Strong, 2009).¹² Kubota notes that the ubiquity of English makes it difficult to make a strong case for American students to learn other languages. The spread of English has also led to an unfortunate assumption that international students who meet admission requirements at U.S. universities will not need further language support (see also Benzie, 2010).

In spite of these setbacks, there are a number of federally funded programs available that promote the study of foreign languages (Goodman, 2009). The National Security Education Program, established in 1991, administers both the David L. Boren Scholarship and Fellowship for overseas language and culture study and The Language Flagship, which supports intensive foreign language study to the advanced level at select institutions in the USA and overseas (Goodman, 2009; National Security Education Program, n.d.; The Language Flagship, 2011). The State Department funds scholarships for domestic and overseas language study and scholarly exchange, including the Gilman Scholarship, the Critical Languages Scholarship, and the Fulbright Program.

There also appears to be a resurgence in an approach to FL learning in HE that had declined in the 1990s: Language across the curriculum (LAC) (Klee, 2009). Originally referred to as *foreign languages across the curriculum* (FLAC) and now referred to as *LAC* or, increasingly, as *culture and language across the curriculum* (CLAC) (Watzinger-Tharp, 2014), this approach calls for more opportunities outside language and literature departments for students to use the languages they have learned:

The primary objective of these programs is to demonstrate to undergraduates who have completed at least four semesters of FL study the benefits of using

¹² This fact sits well with Pennycook's (2001) rejection of *LOTE* in favor of *LOBE*: languages *othered* by English.

documents written in the target language for the perspectives and enhanced understanding they can provide of the course content. (Klee, 2009, p. 619)

Straight (2009) adds that LAC has the additional advantage of promoting a student-centered approach in which students, due to their language skills, can be the experts of material that instructors may not have access to.

Klee offers examples of LAC programs at several institutions: Since 1991 (Straight, 2009) SUNY Binghamton has offered a language across the curriculum program (abbreviated as LxC) for courses taught in English but with some assignments and weekly discussion groups in several other languages. International students serve as leaders for the discussion groups. The program is described as follows on the university website: “LxC is a curricular enrichment program that provides you with the opportunity to apply your existing languages skills [sic] in courses outside of languages departments in languages other than English” (Binghamton University, n.d.). According to their website, the LxC component was available in Spring Semester 2012 for three courses in international business and history. By Spring 2015 the LxC course offerings had grown to six courses in computer science, history, health, and business.

The University of Minnesota Foreign Language Immersion Program offered a variety of content courses delivered in LOTE to students who had had at least 3 years of study in the language of instruction. Ohio State’s Chinese Flagship program pairs L2 Chinese learners with trained L1 Chinese mentors who are experts in the L2 learners’ fields of study. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill offers LAC instructor training, including a Graduate Certificate in LAC Instruction (UNC-Chapel Hill Area Studies Centers, n.d.)

It is imperative that FL faculty be involved in campus internationalization efforts

in order for initiatives such as LAC to be possible. Gehlhar (2009) suggests several ways for FL faculty to make connections across the campus so they can be seen as important resources to other departments that are attempting to internationalize their curricula. If an institution views the use of multilingual skills as an expected and integral part of IHE, FL faculty can help their non-FL colleagues achieve this goal. They can, for example, adapt their courses to the academic needs and interests of their students; help students find accessible materials related to their area of study in their target language; work with non-FL faculty to identify opportunities for incorporation of FL materials and then develop modules, activities, assignments, or adjunct courses; and integrate the above approaches with study abroad programs to provide better predeparture preparation for students and continued development upon their return (Straight, 2009).

Role of culture in internationalization. Another way for institutions to integrate internationalization into their curricula is through a concerted effort at promoting intercultural learning aimed at developing intercultural competence. Intercultural learning is not the same thing as simply learning about other cultures. It includes learning that other perspectives exist and have legitimacy as well as learning about those perspectives—or even moving beyond learning about to learning from other cultures (Miike, 2015). Stiers (2003) highlights this difference in his model of intercultural competence, which comprises content competencies (knowing *what*) and processual competencies (knowing *how*). The latter category includes intrapersonal (further delineated into cognitive and emotional competencies) and interpersonal competencies.

Through intercultural learning, people's perspectives may be broadened or changed, which is one goal of internationalizing curricula (Strong, 2009). Underscoring

the value of intercultural learning, Institute of International Education (IIE) President and CEO Allan Goodman is quoted in an IIE press release as saying, “Active engagement between U.S. and international students in American classrooms provides students with valuable skills that will enable them to collaborate across cultures and borders to address shared global challenges in the years ahead” (Institute of International Education, 2010, November 15). What he does not specify is how to promote this active engagement.

Otten’s (2003) IHE framework includes a focus on intercultural learning. He differentiates between intercultural encounters and intercultural competence and notes that even intercultural encounters are not guaranteed by the limited approach to IHE that stops at a level akin to structural diversity as defined above by Gurin et al. (2002): “Cultural diversity and internationalisation do not automatically lead to intercultural contacts and intercultural learning experiences” (Otten, 2003, p. 14). According to research on the contact hypothesis, when they do occur without reflection or awareness, intercultural encounters can even lead to reinforcement of stereotypes and negative attitudes (Otten, 2003). This was certainly found to be the case in Fitch and Morgan’s (2003) study on the construction of international teaching assistant identities by U.S. undergraduates (see below). It would seem, then, that Ramsay, Jones, and Barker’s (2007) call for faculty to provide opportunities for intercultural contact among their students does not go far enough—the contact would need to be structured in a way that promoted learning.

Otten (2003) stresses that institutional support is vital to the development of intercultural competence in students. He defines *intercultural competence* as “a long-term change of a person’s knowledge (cognition), attitudes (emotions), and skills (behaviour)

to enable positive and effective interaction with members of other cultures both abroad and at home” (p. 15) and states that it is acquired through “the experience of differences that causes cognitive irritation, emotional imbalance, and a disruption of one’s own cultural worldview” (p. 15). It was this process that participants in the course internationalization workshop discussed above experienced (Schuerholz-Lehr et al., 2007). One of those faculty participants came to see internationalization as “a process relevant to everyone’s appreciation of the limited vision we have when our filters are in place and the benefits we can gain from considering other frames of reference” (p. 83).

Following his description of the internationalization at home efforts at the University of Minnesota, Paige (2003) compares their impact to a revised version of Amir’s (1969, 1998) contact hypothesis¹³:

International learning for U.S. students (as well as international students) would occur through sustained and meaningful contact that was supported by the institution, involved goals relevant to students, and operated with equality of status among people participating in programs as a key principle. (p. 56)

Ramsay et al. (2007) recommend an intercultural training approach with the use of critical incidents during orientation to facilitate students’ intercultural adjustment. The assumption underlying the insistence on institutional support for student intercultural learning, however, is that faculty and staff themselves possess intercultural competence and have training in facilitating its development in their students.

¹³ Amir (1969, 1998) argued that, although research had found that intergroup contact could lead to reduced prejudice and improved intergroup relations, there is no guarantee that all forms of intergroup contact will have positive outcomes. Several factors contribute to the outcome, including inter alia the nature of the contact activity and institutional intervention and/or support for the type of intergroup contact that will lead to positive change.

International Students

International student recruitment clearly plays a large role in IHE for many institutions. Accordingly, it is important to examine the research into the orientations and approaches to recruitment at HE institutions. But it is important also to look beyond international recruitment and admissions; the changing demographic resulting from increased international student enrollment brings challenges to all members of campus communities. Research has found that faculty and support staff are often aware of the need to change their approach when working with culturally and linguistically diverse populations of students but may not know how to change (e.g., R. Green, 2010; Johnson, 2008; Robertson et al., 2000). The roles that international students play on U.S. campuses and how they are perceived by the host institutions and American students are also deserving of consideration. The roles that are created by and for international students, and the way these students are perceived, play a part in the support programs and structures that HE institutions provide for the students.

Recruitment. Economic rationales are often cited as motivation for increasing international student enrollment in higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Hughes, 2008; Knight, 2004). DeVita and Case (2003), for example, assert that recruitment of international students in the UK is driven by economic and financial factors: HE institutions need to make up for shortfalls from budget cuts by recruiting more full-fee paying (international) students. While HE institutions in the USA face similar budget challenges, Cravcenco (2004) suggests that the recruitment of international students is a more complex matter than the simple pursuit of revenue.

Cravcenco (2004) studied international student recruitment at four HE institutions

and built a conceptual model of institutional internationalization based on their approaches to recruitment. This model includes several intersecting factors, including internal and external influences on international student recruitment and enrollment, recruitment ideologies, and recruitment strategies. She found that external forces, such as existing and growing demand from international students, inter-institutional competition for international students, and advances in technology that have allowed for faster and cheaper dissemination of information and communication with prospective students and applicants, tend to have predictable effects—that is, they tend to be similar among institutions with similar profiles. Internal forces, on the other hand, vary greatly across institutions. These forces help shape an institution’s recruitment ideology (or ideologies, as she noted that institutions tend to have more than one), which in turn shapes the recruitment strategies that institutions adopt. Although it is difficult to understand how exactly Cravcenco is using the term *ideology*, she does give a broad definition of *academic ideology* in the penultimate chapter of her dissertation: “A set of doctrines, the framework, through which the organization’s participants make sense of their own experiences” (Tierney, 1991, as cited in Cravcenco, 2004, p. 613). She also quotes Tierney’s (1991) understanding that “underneath [the] surface of an organization’s culture, an ideology is at work that both shapes and is shaped by the cultural actions of the participants” (Cravcenco, 2004, p. 614). She notes, however, that she takes a descriptive perspective in her work rather than sharing Tierney’s critical perspective.

The four international student recruitment ideologies that Cravcenco (2004) identified are global diversity, academic entrepreneurialism, academic elitism, and convenience. The ideology of global diversity, which Cravcenco characterizes as

idealistic (i.e., a concept that HE administrators valued but did not often see as achievable), was determined to be shaped by such forces as institutional commitment to intellectual diversity and perceived needs to prepare HCN students for the global job market by exposing them to other cultures. In this ideology, international students are seen as a source of intellectual benefits, for example, as sources of world knowledge; as contributors to the intellectual community; and as holders of diverse cultures, ideas, and perspectives. Academic entrepreneurialism, on the other hand, was characterized as a pragmatic ideology and was found to be shaped by the financial and economic needs of the institutions. Financial benefits of increased international student enrollment include higher out-of-state tuition rates, fees (which Cravcenco does not specify), and revenue from other living expenses. Not all the administrators interviewed in her study agreed that international students were good sources of revenue, however, as some saw them as a drain on resources. Cravcenco also found that international students fulfilled several economic needs of HE institutions by providing human resources in the form of research and teaching assistants, sustaining some academic departments, stabilizing fluctuating enrollment, and bringing in future graduate students through alumni networks.

The driving force behind academic elitism, according to Cravcenco (2004), is the accrual of reputational benefits. High ability international students—with high standardized test scores, GPAs, retention, and graduation rates—raise institutional profiles, which then makes it easier for the institutions to recruit more high ability students. In addition, she argues, many international students come from well-off families representing the elite of their countries. These factors may contribute to both formal institutional rankings and the general reputation of or prestige associated with the

institutions. Finally, institutions with an ideology of convenience tended to have longstanding “pipelines” that brought in sufficient numbers of international students with little extra institutional effort. These institutions enjoyed a strong international reputation and a large international alumni base.

Taking a very different approach from Cravcenco (2004)—one that is decidedly critical—Urciuoli (2003) analyzes how *diversity* (among other terms, such as *excellence*, *skills*, and *leadership*) has been used as a selling point in HE discourses of recruitment and marketing. This analysis is part of her larger body of work analyzing the way this term is used in several different discursive fields in an HE institution. Rather than looking at how or why institutions recruit diverse populations of students, she is interested in how an institution positions itself as diverse or as valuing diversity and what it might mean to do so. Although she notes that the term *diversity* can be used inclusive of international diversity, it most often refers to intranational racial or ethnic (and sometimes gender) diversity in HE. I include Urciuoli’s work here in spite of this fact because, as mentioned above, I acknowledge the parallels between internationalization and diversity in HE and look to some research into diversity to inform my research into IHE.

Urciuoli’s (2003) argument is that the term *diversity*, as employed in promotional discourses in HE, has become linked to such concepts as *excellence* and *leadership* through lexical ordering (defined below). She traces the use of these and other terms in promotional (recruiting and marketing) materials to denote both qualities that an HE institution claims for itself and desirable qualities that it either seeks and promises to develop further in its students (in the case of *excellence* and *leadership*) or seeks as fixed properties of students (in the case of *diversity*). These terms “have all developed shared

denotata as ‘assessable qualities that individuals can bring to the good of the whole’ that have become relatively presupposed in academic-institutional discursive fields” (p. 398), particularly within the neoliberal marketization (Collins, 2001; De Vita & Case, 2003) of HE. *Leadership*, says Urciuoli (2003), “is about fitting into a highly structured world, ... is clearly related to notions of advancement, and ... is measurable on resumés” (p. 394).

The use of the term *excellence*, Urciuoli suggests after Readings (1996, as cited in Urciuoli, 2003), marks a shift from a political to an economic framing of the public sphere. Within HE, “the invocation of *excellence* as a universal, integrating and measurable quality marks the university’s shift away from national culture and toward globalized corporate culture” (p. 399). Urciuoli demonstrates the pragmatic congruence that *diversity* is achieving (or has achieved) with *excellence* in an excerpt from a college president’s speech. In this speech, the president juxtaposes a “commitment to excellence” with a recognition of the value of diversity “in its capacity to contribute powerfully to the process of learning and to the creation of an effective educational environment” (Urciuoli, 2003, p. 399). Through a process called lexical ordering (Silverstein, as cited in Urciuoli, 2003), the lexical value of *diversity* derives from the established presupposed indexical value of *excellence*.

Taken together, Cravcenco’s (2004) and Urciuoli’s (2003) work underscores the importance of both understanding the complexity of international student recruitment and problematizing recruitment activities. Cravcenco suggests that international student recruitment is informed by a complex set of factors that shape an institution’s stance and recruitment activities. At the same time, Urciuoli highlights the ways that the broad institutional—and even broader HE—discourses can shape efforts at diversification by

showing the connections between discourse and language used in recruitment materials.

Roles and perceptions. Although international undergraduates are the focus of my research, most previous research on international students has focused on graduate students. This section, then, includes research involving international graduate students. I focus on the roles that are made available to international students and the way these students are perceived on U.S. campuses.

International teaching assistants. One of the most visible roles of international students on U.S. campuses is as international teaching assistants (ITAs). Many graduate students, particularly in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, are funded through teaching assistantships that require them to teach undergraduate courses. Most states have regulations regarding the determination of international graduate students' readiness to teach in higher education institutions, mostly referring to the students' proficiency in English (Oppenheim, 1997). These regulations notwithstanding, having ITAs teach undergraduate courses has proven to be a controversial issue. The ITA "problem" has been a topic of debate and an area of scholarship since at least the mid-1980s, referred to then as the *foreign TA problem* (see, e.g., Bailey, 1983; Bailey, Pialorsi, & Zukowski/Faust, 1984; Fisher, 1985).

A decade later, a study of evaluations of all graduate TAs at Auburn University found that ITAs received consistently lower student evaluation results than their "native" counterparts (Twale, Shannon, & Moore, 1997).¹⁴ It was not clear to what degree negative biases played a role in this difference, but the authors did note that the undergraduate population at Auburn University tends to be conservative and

¹⁴ In this study, ITAs (designated IGTAs) were defined as nonnative English speakers, and the native TAs (NGTAs) were native English speakers.

homogeneous, with little familiarity with other cultures. They also noted the frequent complaints and criticisms of ITAs made in student evaluations and media. Their conclusion was that “this prevailing opinion harbored among some undergraduates may prevent them from objectively evaluating IGTAs” (p. 72).

A qualitative study on the identity constructions of ITAs by U.S. undergraduates at a university with a large number of ITAs is particularly illuminating of the need for a greater institutional investment in intercultural competence and sensitivity development for U.S. students. The researchers found “a global perception of the ITA identity in which the details of nationality, ethnicity, status, and academic position are, at best, of secondary importance. What matters is simply that they were foreign” (2003, p. 301). Using focus groups of undergraduates to elicit narratives of experiences with ITAs, Fitch and Morgan (2003) determined what they termed the cultural norm to be negative constructions of ITAs. The primary complaint in the narratives centered on (un)intelligibility with secondary complaints related to teaching behaviors. The narratives commonly contained several examples of othering through use of third-person plural pronouns, as in “You can’t understand them” (p. 303). The students’ negative stories tended to close with a sense of disenchantment with either the ITAs (resulting in a stereotype that could affect future encounters) or the university system that put the ITAs at the head of the classroom. Thus, whereas the ITA is constructed as foreign, unintelligible, and incompetent, the students tend to construct the university as the villain. They may be right, to an extent, if the university administrators assume that by merely using ITAs to teach undergraduates, with no accompanying intercultural training for either group of students, they are internationalizing their campus.

Internationalization agents. In an article on internationalization efforts on community college campuses, Fischer (2008) cites one of the reasons international students are being recruited: “Bringing foreign students to American college campuses is important, ... international educators argue, because they ‘enrich the education’ of all students” (p. 42). Notably, the article does not mention what the role of international students is on college campuses beyond being there to serve the internationalization mission. Altbach and Knight (2007) note the commoditization of international education—“Current thinking sees international higher education as a commodity to be freely traded and sees higher education as a private good, not a public responsibility” (p. 291)—but perhaps it is the international students themselves who are being *commodified*. Their mere presence on campus allows institutions to designate their campuses as internationalized—a selling point to many students (and their parents) (De Vita & Case, 2003) and a “privilege” that many international students pay full fees for (Kubota, 2009). Kubota contrasts the putative exploitation of international students with the treatment that Americans typically receive in study abroad programs that have been created by institutions in non-English speaking countries to meet the needs of the American sojourners. Haigh (2002) cautions, “universities may have to temper their desire for international student dollars with a realistic appraisal of the degree of diversity that their own programmes can handle” (p. 56).

Hughes (2008) notes that although growth in mutual understanding is often cited as a motivation for internationalization, the relationship tends to be unequal as the top receiving nations of international students (USA, Australia, UK, and Canada) also happen

to be weak sending countries.¹⁵

While the guests may feel the need to adjust culturally to the hosts as they live and study in a country for perhaps three or more years, the hosts have little incentive to accommodate their social norms to the guests or attempt to understand *their* culture. (Hughes, 2008, pp. 119-120)

It is not just social norms but educational culture, as well, that the guests are expected to adapt to. As Kingston and Forland (2008) put it, the “‘cultural providers’ (i.e., universities) allow those alien to the culture to visit, learn from, and ultimately return home invigorated from this new cultural experience” (p. 209). They refer to this view as the “colonial hangover” (Wisker, 2000, as cited in Kingston & Forland) model of higher education. They argue against this practice, noting that IHE should be a two-way process. Requiring just one of the cultures to adapt to the other would, they argue, “imply that this culture is the lesser of the two” (p. 211). This expectation that international students and scholars need to adapt fully to the host culture might be seen ethnocentric or as a form of othering or even pathologizing them, denigrating their educational and cultural values. It is also evidence of the colonialism that may still be present in higher education.

Kingston and Forland (2008) stress the need to move beyond the colonial view of “helping” international students accommodate to the (“normal,” “better” or more prestigious) Western academic culture. Rather than this one-way adjustment, they advocate “cultural synergy,” defined by Jin and Cortazzi (2001) as “learners or teachers from two or more cultural backgrounds ... [exerting] mutual effort from all participants to learn about, understand and appreciate others’ cultures and their interpretations of

¹⁵ Hughes (2008) notes another difference that I have long been sensitive to: that when US students do study abroad, it is generally for a short-term (one or two semesters) program and may not involve complete immersion in the host institution, whereas many international students in the USA come for entire degree programs (i.e., they are matriculated students). So even the relatively small number of American students who participate in study abroad programs may not generally have the same depth of experience as many of their international peers in U.S. institutions.

learning and reciprocally to learn with and from others” (Cultural synergy section, para. 1). Cultural synergy would seem to be in keeping with the ACE endorsement of comprehensive internationalization noted above, which calls for transformative change. However, the following example listed on the “Examples of good practice” page of the internationalization toolkit found on the ACE website raises the question of the extent to which U.S. HE institutions are open to other approaches to teaching:

Kalamazoo College has addressed *the need to socialize visiting faculty to American teaching expectations* [emphasis added]. Visiting faculty arrive on campus at least four weeks before the start of the term in which they will be teaching so that they can visit other courses being taught in their discipline. The college also assigns them a faculty teaching mentor and includes them in the new faculty teaching workshops. (ACE, 2011)

Positive roles for international students, in which they are valued for their expertise, do exist. As noted above, international students lead the discussion groups in the UNC-Chapel Hill LAC and SUNY Binghamton LxC programs, and Ohio State’s Chinese Flagship program employs Chinese mentors for their linguistic and disciplinary expertise (Klee, 2009). The Learning with Foreign Students project at the University of Minnesota, based on Mestenhauser’s (1976) monograph of the same name, sees international students as resources, helping domestic students “better understand how they are viewed by people in other nations, teaching about their own countries and cultures, serving as interviewees for ethnographic research, and providing opportunities for native students to develop their culture learning and intercultural communication skills” (Paige, 2003, p. 54).¹⁶ Paige also asserts that the contributions of international scholars make it “emphatically clear that knowledge is being generated all over the world, and that second language and culture competence can enhance scholarship in many ways”

¹⁶ I cannot ignore the rather exploitive tone here and can only hope that language, cultural, and intercultural communication skills learning and exchange goes both ways.

(p. 55).

Support. The literature regarding the support that universities provide for international students can be read in at least two different ways. First, it might be argued that host universities are responding to the needs (variously determined or conceived) of the international students they admit by providing a range of support services. This politically neutral view positions institutions as taking responsibility for their students/clients. An alternative reading, however, centers power/knowledge issues and recognizes that international students are often positioned within deficit discourses as problems that need to be fixed or as in need of remediation. This latter view largely ignores the resources and knowledges that international students bring with them to the USA and focuses only on what they lack with respect to the institutional expectations of (HCN) students (Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008).

Pennycook (2001) notes examples of research that has extended the examination of social and cultural reproduction in schools beyond primary and secondary schooling. Subjugation in terms of class or economics has been found to occur, for example, in ESL classes where refugees are taught the kinds of language skills considered appropriate for low-paying “blue collar” and service-industry jobs (Auerbach, 1995, and Tollefson, 1991, as cited in Pennycook, 2001). A parallel could be drawn to the case of international students being taught the academic skills in EAP courses that are considered appropriate (by whom?) in order to succeed in U.S. HE institutions (i.e., the pragmatic approach to EAP discussed above). In this case, however, it is the students’ culture and knowledge production that is potentially being subjugated. In these cases, as in the deficit view, Bourdieu’s (1991) concept of power as forms of capital is useful. While the international

students at U.S. universities may not lack economic capital, and while all of the students mentioned in these examples possess social, cultural, and linguistic capital, they lack the symbolic capital needed in order for their other forms of capital to be valued in their new marketplace (i.e., in the educational institutions in the USA). To the extent that their various forms of capital are undervalued, these students are seen as lacking knowledge, skills, and so forth.

ITA programs. ITA training programs have traditionally focused on the language and (culturally-appropriate) pedagogical skills international graduates students need to learn to be effective teachers in undergraduate courses (J. Zhou, 2009). A review of articles published in the *ITAIS Newsletter* provides interesting insight into the issues identified as important by those working with ITAs.¹⁷ I reviewed articles published from 2005 to 2010 and noted whether the focus was on (1) training/development for the ITA (linguistic, cultural/pedagogical, assessment, or a combination), (2) training or development/intercultural adaptation for domestic undergraduates, or (3) a strategic plan or responsibility of the institution to support ITAs. In keeping with the needs of the members of the ITAIS, who mainly work as ITA trainers, most of the more than 20 articles dealt with the ITA development. However, even given the ITAIS focus, they still recognized the importance of training for undergraduates and institutional responsibility in their annual report (Petro, 2006) and published a total of four articles in two those areas.

Many universities are now recognizing the need to bring graduate ITAs and undergraduate students together in joint programs. Michigan State University, for example, has used a quarter-long undergraduate buddy program that pairs ITAs with

¹⁷ This newsletter is published by TESOL for the International Teaching Assistants Interest Section.

undergraduates for a series of semistructured activities and group meetings (Altinsel & Rittenberg, 1996). Both parties benefit greatly from this program: “By the end of the program, many buddies had achieved, perhaps for the first time, an ‘open channel’ of communication with a person from another culture” (p. 3, para 5). At another university, undergraduate students have been invited to give feedback to ITA microteaching sessions and then join them for an informal lunch (Jia & Bergerson, 2008). The authors of this case study recommend that, in order to further IHE efforts, institutions allocate greater resources towards improving the intercultural competence of all students by creating more opportunities for them to interact with students who are different from them. Halleck (2008) offers an interesting role play simulation for ITAs and domestic undergraduates to engage in together to help tease out the assumptions and biases underlying the ITA “problem.”

As a result of their study on ITA identity construction, Fitch and Morgan (2003) suggest that universities provide more training for both the ITAs and the undergraduates. They also recommend that departments do more to promote the qualifications and accomplishments of the ITAs so that undergraduates see them as more than simply foreign. Martin (2008) helps ITAs develop strategies to improve their rapport with the students they teach. One technique she suggests is sharing information about their home culture or even their own personal stories.

Several more suggestions for improving ITA training programs have been made. Increasing undergraduate student participation in the programs in order to improve the intercultural interactions, understanding, and competence of all students is a common theme (Fitch & Morgan, 2003; Jia & Bergerson, 2008; J. Zhou, 2009). A differentiated

approach to ITA training based on the differing needs of ITAs (e.g., the variation in ITA roles across departments, the differing levels of experience ITAs have had with U.S. education) has also been recommended (Jia & Bergerson, 2008; J. Zhou, 2009). This approach would, of course, require a greater allocation of resources from institutions, but such an allocation would show the institution's commitment both to teaching and learning and to the support of international students. Other recommendations include addressing diversity, particularly for ITAs that come from more homogenous countries (Zhou, 2009), and incorporating a World Englishes perspective rather than a native-speaker or monolithic English (Alastair Pennycook, 2008) model (Petro, 2006; Zhou, 2009).

Other forms of support. Bartram's (2008) research into the support needs of international students identified three broad areas of needs in general agreement with previous research: (1) socio-cultural needs, which include peer support, contact within and beyond their cohort, and socio-cultural integration; (2) academic needs, including study skills, language, academic advising, and a supportive academic environment; and (3) practical needs, such as program information, orientation, accommodations, finance, and career advising. He found that academic needs were secondary to socio-cultural needs for British and Dutch university students in a joint degree program in those two countries (Bartram, 2008). Many universities do provide a variety of support services for their international students, but students may not always be aware of them or the services may not always match student expectations (Ransom et al., 2005).

In a survey on IHE among all Colorado HE institutions, the support services for international students and faculty cited by 50% or more of the institutions included

orientation, international clubs, assistance with regulations and paperwork, and counseling (academic and personal). Only approximately a third of the institutions cited English language training and faculty support for new colleagues; less than 25% indicated that they offered assistance to international families and faculty mentors; and only six institutions (16%) stated that they offered cross-cultural workshops to the campus community. Many respondents lamented that most of their time was taken up by bureaucratic tasks, leaving little time to assess and address the needs of the international students and scholars or the “effects on Americans involved with international research and exchange” (Theobald, 2008, p. 211).

Paige (2003) paints a more optimistic picture in his case study of IHE at the University of Minnesota, which has a long history of working with international students and scholars. Several programs and structures there are in place to support the international community:

- Learning with Foreign Students Project (see above);
- The International Student & Scholar Services Office offers programming to help international students and scholars integrate into the university social and academic life, including orientations, weekly activities, and intercultural education training; it also maintains a website with links to many informational resources (Regents of the University of Minnesota, 2003);
- Intercultural Communication Workshop, in which the participants (international and domestic) themselves provide the “text” for the course, and their interactions serve as the experiential basis for learning;
- The Minnesota International Student Organization sponsors activities and social

events;

- The Minnesota International Center connects international students with communities and schools throughout the state and oversees the International Classroom Connections Program; and
- The State of MN international student financial support program provides funding for international students in return for the contributions they make to the international education of U.S. students.

In terms of academic needs, recommendations made based on research and practice include discipline-specific language and academic skills (LAS) support for international students (Baik & Greig, 2009); pedagogical and awareness-raising development for faculty (Hellstén & Prescott, 2004; Zamel, 1995), although research has also found that faculty, while sympathetic to the needs of international students, see language development as outside the realm of their responsibility (Andrade, 2010; Zamel, 1995); and approaches to curriculum (re)design that take intercultural perspectives (Peelo & Luxon, 2007; Schuerholz-Lehr et al., 2007; Van Gyn et al., 2009). International students also identified learning support centers as important to their learning and adjustment (Ramsay, Barker, & Jones, 1999).

Working in an Australian context, Baik and Greig (2009) identified three types of LAS support programs in Australian HE institutions: (1) extracurricular generic language or study skills programs provided by central university student services; (2) embedded faculty-based programs and one-off workshops; and (3) credit-bearing English for Academic Purposes courses. They noted several problems with generic LAS support, including low enrollment and attendance as the students did not see the courses as

applicable to their studies, and a lack of evidence that they helped students or that the students transferred the knowledge to specific courses. The latter problem, they surmised, may be due to the fact that there was great variation across disciplines in, for example, writing conventions and expectations. Or it may be that the generic approach fostered the impression that knowledge was objective and external and students were not able to make the association between the knowledge of particular skills (declarative knowledge) and their application (procedural knowledge). Given these problems, they designed and piloted an adjunct ESL course for international students concurrently enrolled in a required architecture course. The pass rate for students actively attending this adjunct course was significantly higher than that for students not attending the course. The university later added more adjunct ESL courses in other disciplines.

In his review of the literature on the language development of international students, Benzie (2010) noted that many academics and students alike viewed language learning and academic literacy as separate from content learning. He called for more programs that integrated the two, as in the adjunct ESL course reported in Baik and Greig (2009), and underscored the need “to challenge the assumption that English language automatically improves during study” (p. 456). He also highlighted the need to ensure that international students have opportunities for immersion in English-language environments outside the classroom affording them opportunities to develop social as well as academic language.

Barriers to Internationalization

Brandenburg and de Wit (2011) painted a rather bleak picture in a brief article called “The End of Internationalization.”¹⁸ I somewhat agree with their characterization of IHE as having lost sight of the original goal of improving education and research. They noted that there tends now to be a focus on the instruments and means of IHE rather than the rationales and outcomes, and they stressed the need to understand that IHE is not a goal in itself but rather a means to an end in helping HE institutions fulfill their role “to help understand this world and to improve our dealing with it” (p. 17). This view coincides with Mestenhauser’s (2002) distinction between international education and internationalization of higher education, described near the beginning of this chapter.

Perhaps the tensions inherent in IHE can explain some of its failings: Although it is viewed by many as a positive development and is often mentioned in university mission statements and other documents, IHE in the USA “is embedded within a national value system” (Kehm & Teichler, 2007, p. 262) that implies that it is better (for Americans at least) to study at home. This orientation may explain two facts noted earlier: the low participation rate of U.S. students in study abroad programs and the comparatively short duration of those programs.

Other possible explanations offered for the limited progress many institutions have made in internationalization are that IHE is contested, poorly understood, or at best complex. The contested nature of what constitutes IHE—as well as how to practice it and evaluate it—was demonstrated in the variety of definitions and frameworks summarized above. In the best-case scenario of an agreed upon definition, the complexity of IHE is

¹⁸ See also Knight (2011) for a similar view of the dilution of IHE to the extent that anything that can be seen as remotely international in nature is being touted as IHE.

daunting. From a curricular standpoint, Van Gyn et al. (2009) posited that faculty generally make only superficial changes in attempts to internationalize their courses because they lack the pedagogical knowledge to make more sophisticated and comprehensive changes. Mestenhauser (2002) characterized international education as an integration of disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge, knowledge of one's own and other cultures and languages, and epistemological knowledge. Given that complexity, proclaiming that an institution that ticks all the boxes on a survey such as the ones used in Horn et al. (2007), Green (2005), or Theobald (2008) is highly internationalized is akin to a student expecting to get an A for attending all of her classes. Both the institutional efforts at IHE and the scholarly attempts to study and measure IHE need to recognize and account for this complexity.

Other barriers or constraints to IHE have been noted in the literature. A Carnegie study found that U.S. faculty were the least interested in IHE out of 14 countries studied (Altbach & McGill Peterson, 2006; McGill Peterson, 2010). It may be that there are structures in place in HE that work against widespread curricular reform and holistic IHE (Olson, 2005). There is, for example, at many institutions a lack of incentives for faculty to go abroad, such that young scholars may refuse Fulbright opportunities because of the possible impact on tenure, and established faculty may fear that extended time abroad will mean they will miss crucial advancements at home (Altbach & McGill Peterson, 2006; McGill Peterson, 2010).

Critical Examinations of IHE

Most of the research on IHE has tended to be descriptive or interpretive, yet there is a growing body of critical research. By *critical* I am referring to research undertaken

with the purpose of emancipation (e.g., critical race theory, feminist theory, Freirian critical pedagogy) or deconstruction (e.g., poststructuralism, queer theory, postcolonialism, posthumanism) (Lather, 2006). The research reviewed in this section draws on a range of theoretical frameworks, all of which involve some questioning of power structures, though they may differ in their views of power, discourse, and subjectivity. I have chosen to group the studies I reviewed by their main focus, although there is bound to be some overlap among these themes. The articles in this section, then, mainly address the marketization of IHE; the ideologies and discourses of IHE; and conceptualizations of and orientations to IHE.

Marketization of HE. Several researchers working in internationalization and diversity in HE have identified neoliberal or market-driven views of HE in late modernity (e.g., De Vita & Case, 2003; M. Haigh, 2008; Kubota, 2009; Oka, 2007; Race, 1998; Stromquist, 2007; Urciuoli, 1999; Williams, 2010). Working from a Foucaultian understanding of discourse, DeVita and Case (2003) offered a critique of IHE in the UK. In examining why HE institutions were not taking advantage of their multicultural resources and not engaging in a reflective and transformative process, the authors argued that internationalization efforts were driven primarily by a marketization discourse. Within this discourse, they identified a “new managerialism” in HE which involved, among other things, the commodification of the curriculum. “The marketisation discourse ... necessitates treating education as a commodity to be packaged and sold on open national and international markets by institutions acting as enterprises” (p. 384). This discourse, they argued, actually worked against the promotion of multiculturalism, openness to diverse views, and critical questioning of the university’s own culture.

In their critique of IHE in the UK, DeVita and Case (2003) identified several reasons that the market model was not appropriate for HE. First, they stated that the role of universities was not consonant with profit motives; higher education institutions should not have to be self-supporting “certificate factories” (p. 387). Second, they argued that “learning experience”—which is what universities should be providing for their students—was not the same as “consumption of the education commodity,” and it was not appropriate for the two to be equated. A better economic market analogy (if one is needed at all), they offered, would be education as an “investment”—with both private and social returns—or as a public good: “a social service that puts intellectual and moral welfare above profitability and which, therefore, can neither be driven by economic considerations nor be fulfilled by market forces” (p. 387). Finally, DeVita and Case cited the elimination of economically unviable (i.e., they do not “break even”) programs and departments as evidence that the market model does not work for HE.

Their critique also centered on the commodification of the curriculum, which I discussed earlier in this chapter in the section on curricular innovation. The infusion approach identified in that discussion can be recast as a first step towards internationalization, DeVita and Case (2003) argued, rather than the achievement of curricular internationalization; this same idea was suggested in Schoorman (1999) (see below). Internationalization needs then to move beyond the infusion approach and work towards culturally inclusive pedagogies. DeVita and Case suggested that faculty need to be reflective about and problematize their pedagogical approaches and teaching behaviors in order to accommodate a range of cultural and individual learning styles. They also noted that HE faculty in the UK tend to be White, middle class, and UK-born, so they

identified a need for more internationally diverse faculty.

Ideologies and discourses of IHE. Stier (2004) examined IHE in Sweden and identified three ideologies that informed conceptualizations of internationalization. He defined ideology as “a set of principles, underpinnings, desired goals and strategies that structure actions and beliefs of international educators—administrative and teaching staff alike—groups, organizations or societies” (p. 85) and noted that ideologies could be consciously or subconsciously held. The three ideologies—idealism, instrumentalism, and educationalism—were not mutually exclusive, he said, and educational administrators typically do not hold only one static ideology. His *idealism* was based on a view of the inherent good of IHE and the potential to develop a more fair and democratic world. Within this view, the role of internationalization was to foster intercultural understanding among domestic students while granting “students and staff from the ‘poor world’ access to essential knowledge and competence” (p. 89). He critiqued this ideology for its ethnocentric (Western) view and conception of a one-way flow of knowledge. It is associated, therefore, with Western cultural imperialism and attempts at global hegemony.

The second ideology Stier (2004) discussed was instrumentalism. Within this ideology, HE is viewed as a way to “maximize profit, ensure economic growth and sustainable development, or to transmit desirable ideologies of governments, transnational corporations, interest groups or supranational regimes” (p. 90). Instrumentalism, Stier claimed, was behind educational policy makers’ emphasis on values such as life-long learning, critical thinking, and intercultural communication: “The primary objective is to ensure a sufficiently large labour force, with adequate skills for competence-demanding jobs, in an increasingly more complex global and multicultural

world” (p. 90). Within this view, education could be seen as a global commodity. Stier critiqued this ideology by pointing out that recruitment of students and faculty from “poor” countries by wealthier Western nations contributed to both the commodification of these individuals and to “brain drain.” Stier contended that along with the economic incentives are hidden “ideocultural goals” (p. 91). He gave the example of the common framework in the European Union—internationalization that actually leads to homogenization.

Stier (2004) did not explicate the third ideology, educationalism, as fully as the other two. He gave this rather vague description: “Educationalists argue that being exposed to and having to adapt to an unfamiliar academic setting (with its unique culture, teaching style, norms and grading system) enriches the overall academic experiences of students and teaching staff alike (Stier, 2002a)” (p. 92). It is not entirely clear what he meant by *enrich*, whether it was only international students and staff who found themselves in an unfamiliar setting they needed to adapt to, or how this view differed from the instrumentalists’ emphasis on intercultural learning.

These three ideologies bear some resemblance to the recruitment ideologies that Cravcenco (2004) identified, with Stier’s (2004) idealism and educationalism mapping onto Cravcenco’s global diversity, and his instrumentalism mapping onto Cravcenco’s entrepreneurialism. There is not, however, complete correspondence between the two sets of ideologies. Stier’s main point was that these different ideologies underlie what can at first appear to be a common understanding of internationalization among policy makers, administrators, and faculty—a point made with stronger empirical support by others (e.g.,

Cravcenco, 2004; Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008; Schoorman, 1999; Oka, 2007).¹⁹

Devos (2003) performed a discourse analysis of the public debate over academic standards and IHE in Australia that occurred following the publication of a report on social scientists' perceptions of the impact of commercialization on academic freedom. She used a Foucaultian notion of discourse to analyze the way in which international students were represented in the discourses of academic standards. Her data set included articles and letters published in several newspapers in Australia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Singapore following the release of the report.

Devos (2003) described the debate as playing out as

a discourse wherein the participation of international students on Australian campuses was equated with declining standards. A regime of truth was constructed within which international students were identified as the bogey, or problem, for Australian higher education rather than, for example, the decline in public funding. (p. 164)

In this discourse, international students were othered, creating an Us and Them dichotomy. Within this dichotomous view, “the international assumes a paradoxical position. It is implicitly less valued in its place as the other and at the same time is more highly valued in economic terms” (p. 164). Liddicoat and Crichton (2008), who also studied IHE in Australia, similarly noted what they called a “discourse of inadequacy” surrounding international students. International students, they argued, arrived with academic experience and knowledges (linguistic, cultural, and academic) gained in a language other than English, but these knowledges were then erased (Gal & Irvine, 1995). The students were judged only or primarily through their use of English as a result of a “monolingual view of bilingual abilities” (Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008, p. 371). The result

¹⁹ Urciuoli (1999, 2000, 2003, 2010) makes a similar point with respect to *diversity* and *multiculturalism*, as discussed previously.

was a deficit view of international students, who were then constructed as in need of remediation.

In contrast to the subjugation of international students once they have arrived at their host institutions, Devos (2003) remarked upon the agency they possessed in the market model of higher education. She noted that, somewhat paradoxically, the international Other held the power to judge—to choose to buy or not the services the Australian institutions were selling in the global HE market. This power marked the Australian academy as somewhat dependent on the international education market. An identity for the Australian academic was constructed in opposition to the “corrupting international student” (p. 165): both as guardian of academic standards and victim to the corrupting influence of the Other.

Another effect of the discourse that Devos (2003) examined was the limits it placed on positions that could be taken up—that is, there was little space for counter arguments. “The scope for a counter discourse was limited by the terms of the discourse and the way in which the issues were represented. This led to a closing down, rather than an opening up of discussion” (p. 164). She noted specifically that there was little discussion of “the question of the quality of university courses and teaching” (p. 162). As a result, there was a striking “failure to engage in a reflective way with questions of how you maintain integrity in your teaching practices at a time of increased commercialization” (p. 165). She offered these examples to illustrate the power of discourse to set limits on what can and what cannot be said.

Devos’s (2003) examination of the public discourse surrounding an issue in Australian higher education is an example of how Foucaultian concepts can be applied to

analyze discourse in IHE. Inasmuch as her study was centered on the public discourse, however, she did not turn this lens on discursive fields within a particular HE institution, which is what Oka (2007) did in her dissertation research.

Oka (2007) examined what she called “pedagogy of the global”—globalization in higher education and teaching the global—at three U.S. universities. She focused on the effect of globalization on higher education processes, the promotion of internationalization in higher education, faculty conceptualizations and teaching of the global, and knowledge production. Her conceptual framework combined four elements: the spatial dynamics of the global; a Foucaultian view of the global as discourse as well as his constructs of knowledge and power; the critical notions of ideology and hegemony; and an anti-colonial “investigat[ion of] both the colonization of knowledge and the academic imperialism of U.S. higher education”(p. 33).

In a well developed dissertation, Oka (2007) examined how the global was taught in several courses, what faculty orientations were to the global, and what knowledge they thought students had and should have had about the global. She also identified what she called hidden narratives of the global, which included narratives about Empire and contradictory consciousness. Throughout her analysis she discussed both faculty conceptualizations of the global and internationalization and their impressions of student conceptualizations and learning. Oka also identified several conflicting, or what she called “double,” discourses. These included multiculturalism and internationalization, and institutional rhetoric and faculty perceptions of institutional support for internationalization. Finally, she identified several absences or gaps in her study. Chief among them was the absence of meaningful discussion of international students with her

interview participants.

Conceptualizations of and orientations to IHE. Schoorman (1999) used critical pedagogy and systems theory to frame her study of orientations to and implementation of internationalization at one university. Her definition of IHE (quoted above in the section “Definitions of IHE”) clearly reflected her view of IHE as a transformative process with an emancipatory goal. She reviewed documents and interviewed administrators, faculty members in science and business, and international doctoral students to gain an understanding of the conceptualizations of internationalization in those departments, their impact on implementation, and the role of international students in the internationalization process. She found that the understandings of and approaches to internationalization differed across and within the constituencies represented in her study.

The administrators saw internationalization as relevant to all aspects and activities of the university. They also viewed faculty as key to implementing internationalization and international students as playing either a positive role or no role in the process. Her faculty participants from the science department, however, represented a range of views that Schoorman (1999) characterized as hostile, skeptical, and pleasantly surprised. The negative attitudes stemmed from a belief that internationalization was an example of “cultural policing” or “fluff” that distracted from the goal of raising standards and engaging in good scientific research. The surprise issued from ignorance of the university’s internationalization mission. These participants saw the sciences, however, as already inherently international. As a result, little reason for change was found, as the school’s operational plan noted: “The science curriculum is essentially universal and international. There is little need for directed internationalization” (p. 29). Some faculty

did, however, comment on the possibility for increased internationalization through student and faculty mobility.

Schoorman (1999) found differences in views of the role of international students in the pedagogical process. Some faculty viewed international students as no different from HCN students. The faculty participants who noted differences seemed to fall into two camps (both with positive views): those who remarked on the better preparedness or higher intellectual capacity of international students, and those who noted the different perspectives to science that students from different world regions brought, which could have a synergistic effect when combined.

In contrast to the science faculty, the business faculty were all aware of the university's internationalization mission and were involved in internationalization efforts. Schoorman (1999) found that the rationale for internationalization in this department seemed to be market-driven (employers, students, accrediting agencies, and other business schools). There was, however, a range of views on the scope of internationalization. Some participants believed that the efforts at curricular internationalization (which consisted of introducing international electives and infusing international content into core MBA program courses) were sufficient. Others felt that the current efforts were inadequate but that it would be unrealistic to expect further change, while some who were dissatisfied with current internationalization efforts called for further efforts. (It should be noted that Schoorman cited only doctoral students holding this last view. It is not clear whether any faculty participants held the same view.) Still others expressed dissatisfaction with current efforts and a need to fundamentally change the approach to internationalization—to go beyond mere content infusion based on the

concepts derived in the domestic context and on market factors—that would entail a reconceptualization of the field.

Within the business department, international students were unanimously viewed by faculty as potential resources. At the same time, however, many of the students themselves did not believe that their perspective or experience as international students had an impact in the classroom. “One student recalled only one course in the doctoral program in which international students were invited to contribute their unique views. The title of the course included the word ‘international’” (Schoorman, 1999, p. 33).

Based on her research findings and her own conceptualization of IHE as a counterhegemonic process, Schoorman (1999) issued several recommendations regarding internationalization. First, she argued, internationalization should be seen as a process. If it is viewed as a set of activities—as in the structure-oriented perspectives discussed earlier in this chapter—there is a danger of stagnation. For example, once enrollment goals were met, or a few “internationalized” courses were developed, further efforts might not be seen as necessary. Here Schoorman advocated a systems theory view and gave the following example: “If the recruitment of international students was the goal of one set of internationalization efforts, departments need to identify how these students can be the impetus for further internationalization efforts” (p. 39). This approach involves viewing the output or goal of one cycle as input for another cycle. In this way, internationalization becomes an ongoing, self-renewing process that all campus units engage in.

Second, internationalization should be comprehensive. Schoorman (1999) gave reasons to support this recommendation but few realistic strategies for achieving this goal.

Her idea that deans and department heads, for example, could use “hiring decisions, financial support, and rewards for such efforts” (p. 39) to promote internationalization rests on the assumptions that (1) the people in these positions value internationalization and (2) they have the power, authority, and resources to take action.

Finally, Schoorman (1999) advanced her recommendation that internationalization be counterhegemonic. This view entails a need to consider carefully the content that is included in the curriculum and make sure international perspectives are integrated throughout it rather than just tacked on. Instructional practices need to promote internationalization of the institution rather than “Americanization” of international students. Efforts must also go beyond the market-based pragmatic approach to IHE seen in the business department and embrace a civic, democratic goal. “The pursuit of seemingly counter hegemonic content for inherently hegemonic purposes (economic dominance) needs to be reexamined” (p. 41). She noted that, in the systems view, the pragmatic approach could be considered an entry point with global democracy as the ultimate goal.

Summary of IHE Research

This review of the literature has shown that previous research into IHE has focused on conceptualizations and models of IHE; on various dimensions of campus internationalization, such as rationales, approaches, programs, services, and curricula; on various populations, including international graduate students, faculty, and administration; and on language. Much of the research has been quantitative, with a smaller body of qualitative research focusing on understandings and/or experiences of internationalization. An even smaller subsection of the qualitative studies has employed a critical lens. It is

clear, then, that there are many aspects of IHE that need more attention in research, and many theoretical approaches that could be taken. In the final section of this chapter, I describe how my study fits with the existing literature and the contributions it makes to the field.

Rationale for the Study and Contributions to the Field

In this study, I center international undergraduate students and the role they play (and are perceived to play) in the internationalization of a university campus in the USA. International undergraduates constitute a newly growing population in U.S. HE institutions that has been largely overlooked in the research, which has tended to focus on graduate students. While centering international undergraduates and their experiences, I am also interested in the institution's positioning of and responsibilities towards them. Accordingly, my research involves participants from several campus constituencies—including administration, staff, faculty, and international undergraduates themselves—by exploring their conceptualizations of and perspectives on IHE and the role of international undergraduates within internationalization efforts and on the implications of increased international student enrollment.

I additionally attempt to bring a poststructural perspective into IHE research. This perspective involves a “restive problematization of the given” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 107) and a focus on language. I trouble categories, assumptions, and my own methods throughout the research and writing processes. I describe these processes and my conceptual framework more fully in Chapter III, where I outline my methodology.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the study design and philosophical underpinnings of my research. I begin by discussing my overall orientation to research and approach to this study. That section leads into a presentation of the theoretical framework I am using. Next, I describe the research context: the site and participants. The following two sections deal with data. I discuss my approach to what is traditionally called data collection, which I am calling data construction, and then, I outline my data transformation (analysis) process, which I have conceived of as meaning construction and data problematization. I end with a section on trustworthiness, which includes some discussion of reflexivity, although I also address reflexivity and ethical concerns in other sections of this chapter where appropriate.

Overall Approach and Orientation to Research

Questions posed in research are shaped by elements of the embodied researcher's (Ortbals & Rincker, 2009) background, including the social, historical, and political contexts in which she has lived. By *embodied*, I am recognizing the material effects that identity characteristics, such as gender, race, ethnicity, and so forth, have on experiences and interpretations of those experiences (see, e.g., Grosz, 1994; Pillow, 2000). These elements contribute to the researcher's philosophical assumptions, which form her

theoretical perspective and through which the questions (and all thinking and meaning making) are filtered. These contextually situated questions, in turn, influence the researcher's choice of research methodology and methods. As Denzin and Lincoln characterize this process, "the gendered, multiculturally situated researcher approaches the world with a set of ideas, a framework (theory, ontology) that specifies a set of questions (epistemology) that he or she then examines in specific ways (methodology, analysis)" (2008, p. 28). The kinds of questions that I ask in this study have been taken up within a qualitative research framework.

Qualitative research does not refer to a single approach to inquiry. It is an overarching term and has been defined in many ways. The definition that I will use—which is but one definition among many—is from Denzin and Lincoln's *Handbook of Qualitative Research*:

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 4)

Denzin and Lincoln go on to note both the wide range of empirical materials that are used as data and the range of interpretive practices that are employed in attempts at achieving the purpose(s) of a study. Crucially, they note, "each practice makes the world visible in a different way" (p. 5), hence, the common use of multiple interpretive practices in any one study.

As a part of the social world I am observing, I have not approached this situated

(research) activity from an objective or neutral stance. In the poststructural tradition,²⁰ I recognize that objectivity is not possible in any kind of research, nor is research ever an innocent undertaking. According to Foucault's understanding of the power/knowledge relation, "whatever knowledge comes from research in the disciplines is always implicated in power considerations" (Bloland, 1995, p. 530). I recognize that my research has been generally framed by my experiences, the time in which I am living, and the identity categories I perform,²¹ and specifically framed by opinions I hold regarding the internationalization of higher education (IHE), intercultural learning, and language. I am driven by what I see as a need for transformation in higher education that would involve a broadening of what is recognized as research, knowledge, and ways of knowing. I see comprehensive, holistic, intentional approaches to IHE as one way to work towards the pluralization of meanings and meaning-making activities in the postmodern university²² and to provide an environment that encourages translanguaging. Translanguaging is "the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative

²⁰ Poststructuralism (PS) has been discussed and defined by many scholars working in many different disciplines, including linguistics, literary theory, social sciences, and education. St. Pierre and Pillow's (2000) description of PS appeals to me: "the academic theorizing and critiques of discourse, knowledge, truth, reality, rationality, and the subject of the last half of the twentieth century, particularly those enabled by French philosophers" (pp. 16-17), such as Baudrillard, Deleuze (and Guattari), Derrida, Foucault, and Lyotard. The relationship between PS and postmodernism has also been variously characterized. St. Pierre and Pillow, for example, situate the academic theorizing of PS within postmodernism's "broader 'set of cultural changes' brought about by critiques of colonialism, racism, patriarchy, homophobia, and ageism reflected in popular as well as 'high' culture" (p. 17). Bloland (1995), on the other hand, suggests that poststructuralist thought gave rise to the postmodern perspective (p. 523).

²¹ I am using *perform* here in the nonessentialist sense of *performativity*—gender as performative (Butler, 1990), identity as a performative category (Pennycook, 2001), and the performativity of discourse as practice (Price, 1999).

²² Bloland (1995) notes that postmodernism mounts a "devastating attack on modernism" that "renders as questionable the major assumptions and assertions of our modern culture. ... It makes problematic what is taken for granted in a wide range of topics" (p. 525). According to Bloland, HE institutions are among the primary institutions subject to "critical postmodern scrutiny."

potential” (García, 2009, p. 140).

As I stated in Chapter I, I am situating this study within the framework of Pennycook’s (2001) (post)critical applied linguistics. This framework combines a critical view that allows for change with a poststructural approach that questions or troubles (Lather, 1991, 1996) disciplinary and theoretical givens. The critical focus centers on connecting the local (micro) contexts that ground more traditional approaches to applied linguistics with the broad (macro) social, cultural, and political domains. Questions of power, equity, access, resistance, difference, and agency, for example, are taken up within micro and macro relations. These inquiries are guided by compassion and a vision for *preferred futures* that are “grounded in ethical arguments for why alternative possibilities may be better” (p. 9). By putting forward, in the previous paragraph, IHE as one possible way to transform higher education, I am stating my preferred futures vision. I am not advocating any one model or set of identifying categories of IHE. Rather, I envision a flexible space that encourages plurality. A problematizing stance, in turn, questions not only current givens but also future recommendations; this move involves *self-reflexivity*—a constant questioning of the self (as a researcher, a methodology, or a discipline) and an awareness of the limitations of knowing. Pennycook (2001) describes (post)critical applied linguistics as being “concerned with raising a host of new and difficult questions about knowledge, politics, and ethics” (p. 8).

Poststructural views of language, truth, knowledge, and research depart from foundational views of transparency and correspondence in language, universality and stability in truth, and objectivity in knowledge and research. The poststructural view of language is that there is no direct correspondence between language/words (signifier) and

meaning (signified) and that language does not merely reflect social reality: language is a social practice and meaning is socially determined. This social determination of meaning translates into the local and partial nature of knowledge and the construction of identity: “Language constructs one’s subjectivity in ways that are historically and locally specific” (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2008, p. 476). In this view, knowledge is partial in both senses of the word: incomplete and biased. Objective truth is viewed as a myth—there is no fixed, universal reality or meaning that exists outside of a knowing subject. History and our knowledge of it are never complete, so the truth of any given knowledge claim can change over time. Following Richardson and St. Pierre (2008), I want to emphasize that the postmodern view is not antiknowledge; it is just suspicious of claims to universal and objective knowledge. As they state, “a postmodern position does allow us to know ‘something’ without claiming to know everything. Having a partial, local, and historical knowledge is still knowing” (p. 476). Because “social phenomena are in a constant state of flux” (Baronov, 2004, p. 160), it is not possible to make generalizations. Grand theories, metanarratives, and totalizing discourses (Schwandt, 2001) are, therefore, to be questioned. What researchers can do, then, is present individual cases as temporary, localized knowledge (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008).

The above premises entail that no method of inquiry can be privileged over all others, which creates a space in which researchers may engage in *bricolage*. *Bricoleurs* piece together interpretations using “whatever strategies, methods, and empirical materials are at hand ... invent[ing], or piec[ing] together, new tools or techniques” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 5) as needed. This approach must not be mistaken for *flabby pluralism* (Bernstein, 1991, as cited in Schwandt, 2001), which is merely superficial

borrowing from several perspectives. Rather, my postfoundational belief that there is not one best method to find—or grand theory that explains—“Truth” affords me the freedom to combine methodological approaches—or perhaps even necessitates that I do so. As Kincheloe and McLaren (2008) note in their discussion of critical research, “the bricolage exists out of respect for the complexity of the lived world and the complications of power” (p. 421). To me, the art of *bricolage* is necessary under conditions in which both the process and the outcomes of research are shifting, not fixed. The dynamic nature of the process required me to adapt to the ever-changing context, participants, and data and change my methods, appeal to different conceptual frameworks, or even alter my questions as needed; the instability of the outcome is seen both in terms of knowledge or understanding (the impermanence and partialness of knowledge claims) and in the form of a written report (the instability of language).

Conceptual Framework

In a bricolage of a critical stance with a poststructural skepticism that (post)critical applied linguistics allows, the purposes of this study include both understanding and complicating what it means to members of a university community for that university to (seek to) increase its international undergraduate student population as part of a broad initiative for campus internationalization. I aimed to explore the fraught, contested nature of conceptualizations of campus internationalization, of practices of internationalization, and of their effects. This research is less an attempt to describe the approach to IHE at a university or to catalogue all of the activities that may be subsumed under that rubric. Rather, it is an exploration of the experiences and conceptualizations of IHE of a few individual members of a university community and the discourses that

constitute and are constituted by them. To accomplish these aims, I have drawn from a diverse set of practices and tools that can be found in (post)critical approaches to qualitative research, including a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis, a poststructural view of identity and subjectivity, and a theoretical orientation towards intercultural education called *cultural synergy* (Jin & Cortazzi, 2001). I will explain these three components in the following paragraphs.

Pennycook (2001) describes a (post)critical applied linguistics approach to text as a “poststructuralist practice that aims to explore the discursive construction of reality across different sites” (p. 111). First, this approach views language (and literacy) as always political—there is no objective or neutral position that language can take outside political relations. This view is consonant with the poststructural view of language described above in terms of the social determination of meaning; it is also directly related to Foucault’s notion of the productive nature of power—“power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth” (Foucault, 1979, as cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 92) —and its relationship to knowledge and language: “It is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together” (Foucault, 1980, as cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 92).

The (post)critical linguistics approach to text also focuses on processes of both production and reception, which must be understood, Pennycook (2001) stresses, “in terms of contextual, subtextual, and pretextual constraints and possibilities” (p. 111). Taking these considerations into account, the aim is for an understanding that strikes a balance between an overdetermination of texts by social contexts and an underdetermination that allows for texts to be completely open to any and all

interpretations. He also notes that while there are preferred readings or interpretations of texts within any culture, “readers, listeners, or viewers may interpret texts in line with, in negotiation with, or in opposition to such preferred readings” (p. 111).

According to Pennycook (2004), the poststructural view of discourse is “the site where our subjectivities are formed and reality is produced” (p. 10). Pennycook appeals to Foucault in order to make a distinction between language and discourse:

Discourse in this [Foucauldian] sense, therefore, does not refer to language or uses of language, but to ways of organizing meaning that are often, though not exclusively, realized through language. Discourses are about the creation and limitation of possibilities, they are systems of power/knowledge (*pouvoir/savoir*) within which we take up subject positions. (Pennycook, 1994, p. 128)

Simply put, discourses can be thought of as “ways that an issue or topic is ‘spoken of’ through ... speech, texts, writing, and practice” (Carabine, 2001, p. 268).

Discourses are productive, constitutive, constructive: “they construct a particular version of [X] as real” (Carabine, 2001, p. 268). For my purposes, X could be *international student* or *internationalized university*. Discourses also operate to determine and maintain “truths” and exclude other possible truths. In this way, they produce normative notions that then map onto ideas about morality (good and bad, right and wrong) and acceptable or unacceptable behavior and practices. “Discourses are historically variable ways of specifying knowledge and truths, whereby knowledges are socially constructed and produced by effects of power and spoken in terms of ‘truths’” (Carabine, 2001, 275). Power is constituted through discourses, and “knowledge both constitutes and is constituted through discourse as an effect of power” (Carabine, 2001, 275).

I am following Carabine’s (2001) guidelines for Foucauldian genealogical

discourse analysis in my study of discourses of IHE and international students. Though Foucault used genealogy to examine the production of discourses over time, Carabine suggests that “we can use genealogy to provide a ‘snapshot’ of a particular moment without resorting to tracing its history, and that this will still tell us something about discourse/power/knowledge” (2001, p. 280). My analysis provides a snapshot of some of the discourses of IHE, international students, and language that are circulating at UU at this particular point in time. This type of genealogical analysis involves identifying themes in texts (interviews, observation notes, documents); looking for relationships among discourses, absences or silences, and resistances or counter-discourses; and identifying discursive strategies and effects of the discourses. As the discourses of IHE are embedded within other discourses, including *inter alia* discourses of higher education, of teaching and learning or pedagogy, and of language learning and language use, my analysis also identifies some of the normalized behaviors in the higher education culture/classrooms at the University of Utah (UU).

In addition to this broad level of discourse analysis, I engaged in a focused analysis of the terms *international student*, *domestic student*, and related terms used synonymously or in opposition to them in the discourses of internationalization, international students, and language at UU. I view these terms as lexical labels, which constitute one form of (politically contested) representation and can be considered brief texts (Mehan, 1996). “The process of lexical labeling is itself an entextualization process. Complex, contextually nuanced discussions get summed up in (and, hence, are entextualized through) a single word” or phrase (p. 253). Mehan gives the example of different labels that may be used to represent the same group of people. Two of those

labels are *guest worker* and *illegal alien*. Those two labels, or modes of representation, reference different discourses (or apply different discursive strategies) while “relationally defin[ing] the person making the representation and constitut[ing] the group of people ... in a distinctive way” (Mehan, 1996, p. 254).

My view of identity, informed by poststructuralism, is quite different from the humanist foundational idea of a stable self (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000). I think of identity not as a fixed thing, but rather as a process. We do not *have* identities; we are constantly (in the process of) *constructing* both our own identities and identities of others. Within poststructuralism, the term *subjectivity* is often used in place of *identity* to highlight the role of discourse in identity construction. Discourses open up or close off various subject positions. As Richardson and St. Pierre (2008) note, “because the individual is subject to multiple and competing discourses in many realms, one’s subjectivity is shifting and contradictory—not stable, fixed, rigid” (p. 477). My analysis of the discourses of IHE that my participants take part in includes considerations of the identities or subjectivities those discourses make available to them.

The final piece of my framework does not explicitly declare allegiance to a (post)critical paradigm although it is in fact critical in nature. It is a theoretical orientation that Jin and Cortazzi (2001) call *cultural synergy*. This orientation was developed for use in educational contexts in which teachers and learners are from two or more cultural backgrounds. It came out of their work with Chinese learners and American teachers of English, so the focus was on both the macro level of national cultures and also the micro or localized level of individual classrooms. Cultural synergy entails mutual effort from groups of learners and instructors from different cultures of learning—with variation in

ideas, expectations, and practices—to learn about, understand, and appreciate others’ cultures and others’ interpretations of learning and to learn with and from others. Jin and Cortazzi outline a series of critical questions, which they call *dilemmas*, that they argue need to be addressed in culturally diverse educational contexts:

- A dilemma of expectations: who expects what and how do we know this?
- A dilemma of change: who changes; is this imposed or negotiated?
- A dilemma of choice: what are the real choices regarding the right to learn with different cultures of learning when some are differentially recognized in terms of status or power?
- A dilemma of context: what are participants’ perceptions of the validity of different aspects of cultures of learning in different academic contexts?
- A dilemma of identity: [...] how do cultures of learning relate to multiple identities? [...]
- A dilemma of interaction: when all participants are aware of different cultures of learning, who uses which one, when, where, how, and why? (p. 2)

Some of these dilemmas informed questions I asked participants in interviews, and some took the form of codes when I analyzed the resulting data. For example, I asked faculty members about their expectations regarding the behavior of international students in their classes, and whether these expectations have had any impact on their teaching. Similarly, I asked international students about their expectations regarding the behavior (e.g., teaching styles, assignments, grading, advising) of their professors. I also asked international students to compare their experiences as students at UU and in their home countries and any other countries where they had long-term experiences as students. These areas of questioning helped me get at how the dilemmas of expectation and change play out among UU faculty and international students.

Context

This study was carried out between January 2013 and December 2014, following IRB approval in December 2012. While I intended to complete data construction in a 1-

year period, my work on the project was interrupted by a series of unanticipated events in my personal life. These events not only impacted the timeline of the study but also interrupted my work with IUG participants. I explain the impact more fully below.

Research Site

I chose to conduct this research at UU, a Research University (very high research activity [RU/VH]), according to the 2010 Carnegie Classification, located in Salt Lake City, Utah, USA.²³ UU was an ideal site for this research inasmuch as it had stated a commitment to both internationalization in general and international student enrollment specifically. “International involvement”; a commitment to local, regional, and international students; and “the broad and liberal education of all its students and their familiarity with a changing world” are all part of UU’s mission (University of Utah, n.d.). Evidence of a policy initiative for internationalization at UU can be found in documents that predate this study as well as documents that have been produced since its inception: A former university president formed a task force on internationalization, and the recommendations of that task force formed the backbone of the current president’s global strategy blueprint.²⁴ In addition, from the time that the task force published its report (Presidential Task Force on Internationalization of the University, 2006) to the time I began this research, UU experienced a rapid increase in the number of international undergraduate students from China, owing in part to the Kaplan pathways programs described in Chapter I. This population was of particular interest as it represented a

²³ This classification is roughly equivalent to *Research I University* under the 1994 classification system.

²⁴ With the establishment of the Office for Global Engagement, the new university president demonstrated a continued commitment to internationalization at UU. In his first official e-mail as president to university faculty, students, and staff, the new president expressed continued support for international opportunities for faculty and students “to prepare our students for an increasingly globalized world.”

relatively new phenomenon both at this university and across the country (i.e., larger numbers of undergraduates from China than in the past). In the same period, UU saw growth in numbers of students from other countries, as well.

In October 2005, the fall of the academic year in which the Presidential Task Force issued its recommendations, international undergraduate enrollment (categorized as “nonresident aliens” by the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis) was at 532, or 2.35 % of the total 22,661 (UU, 2006). By the 2011–2012 academic year, both the raw number of international undergraduates and the percentage they represented of all undergraduates had more than doubled to 1,214 undergraduate international students enrolled at UU, representing approximately 5% of the 24,297 total undergraduates (UU, 2012). The number of international undergraduates continued to increase. By Fall 2014, there were 1,576 out of 23,907, representing 6.6%. Taking all students (undergraduate and graduate) into account, the current enrollment of 2,804 international students out of 31,515 total matriculated students, or 8.9%, falls short of the goal of 10% set out in the 2006 Task Force report, but the increase is noticeable. In response to this increase, UU hired more full-time (adjunct) ESL instructors as well as more student services personnel dedicated to advising international students and developed more courses and programs targeting their needs.

UU’s continued and perhaps growing interest in IHE is also apparent in several developments that postdate the conception of this research. UU hosted a state-wide summit on international education in the fall of 2011 that drew educators from several institutions in Utah and a few from outside the state. Following the recommendation of the 2006 Task Force report—which was reiterated in the 2013 Global Strategy

Blueprint—the Office for Global Engagement was created in 2013. This office is led by the cabinet-level position of Chief Global Officer, signalling its importance to the University. Perhaps the most visible undertaking of the new Office has been its involvement in UU’s new Asia Campus in Songdo, South Korea. UU is one of the four founding institutions of the Incheon Global Campus and admitted its first undergraduate cohort in Fall 2014. Though the UU Asia Campus clearly plays a role in UU’s internationalization strategy, my research focuses on people and events on the Salt Lake City campus.

Participants

In this study, I have attempted to center international undergraduate students at UU—in terms of their own subjectivities and experiences and also in the way that they are constructed and represented by others on campus. I see these students not as the cause of internationalization at UU but as one of the effects of IHE in the USA (or even globally) as a whole and at UU in particular. In so doing, and in keeping with a “possible response to the postpositivist crisis of representation” (Gamradt, 1998, p. 69, note 2), I have taken care to avoid objectifying, essentializing, or exoticizing these students. I have also endeavored to keep in mind the limits to my knowing, the shifting nature of my participants’ subjectivities, and the ongoing nature of their experiences. My interpretations of interactions with them at any one given time (or even over a period of time) do not represent a complete or a stable account of their conceptualizations, subjectivities, and experiences.

As I noted at the beginning of this chapter, my view is that all knowledge is partial, temporal, and local (i.e., embedded in a sociocultural context and a historical

time). Throughout this project and the resulting dissertation, I have tried to avoid creating an illusion of stable truths or conditions out of what I view as fluid, messy, and perhaps contradictory experiences. Through interacting with many people, what I have attempted to do is get a sense of both the larger context at UU and some of the viewpoints and experiences of a small number of individuals, and the discourses that constitute/are constituted by them. In order to explore multiple perspectives on the role of international students in campus internationalization, I used purposeful selection strategies to invite international undergraduate students, faculty and staff members, and administrators to be research participants.²⁵

All of the participants were invited via e-mail—with a few exceptions noted below, I sent individual e-mails addressing the people by name. The invitation e-mails introduced the study (purpose, initial research questions, methods) and detailed both my role and responsibilities as the researcher and those of the participants, including the expected time commitment—a “research bargain” (Hatch, 2002). I then sent copies of the appropriate consent form to each prospective participant who had either expressed an interest in the study or agreed outright to be interviewed. I gave them opportunities to ask me questions about the research and their potential participation before scheduling an initial meeting with them. At each initial meeting with a new participant, I reviewed the consent form, asked if there were any questions, and reminded them that they could opt out at any time.

For the student participants, I operated on the assumption that they may not have been involved in research in the past and may not have read any qualitative research

²⁵ I use the term *selection strategy* rather than the more widespread term *sampling strategy* in order to underscore the fact that I am not attempting to draw a representative sample and that this is not the type of research that aims for generalizability.

reports. Therefore, I took the time to explain in detail how I would be preserving their anonymity in my write up, what information I would disclose about them, and how I might use their words and ideas. I showed them examples from a qualitative interview research project I had carried out several years ago. We then talked about the ways they would participate in the study and signed two copies of the consent form—one of which they kept—and started the first interview.

It is important to note that my aim was not to attempt to sample every possible constituent or viewpoint at UU. In keeping with the aims of qualitative research, generalizability from a sample to a larger population was not a goal of this study. Individual experiences and voices are valued within this approach to research and were sought in this work.

International students. I planned on working with at least four international undergraduate students in their 2nd or 3rd year at UU—long enough for them to have taken several classes and had an extended experience at the university, but ideally not so long that they would have forgotten their initial feelings and experiences at UU.²⁶ I wanted to conduct multiple formal interviews with each of them and observations of at least two of them. As it turned out, I conducted single interviews with several students, multiple interviews with three students, and an observation of one, as detailed below.

I began recruitment of international undergraduates (IUGs) in early Spring 2013 by emailing a call for participation to 10 different international student organizations on campus. I also emailed instructors of several general education courses with large international student enrollment and instructors in the ESL program asking if they would

²⁶ I am aware of the contested nature of recall and the active construction of memories. As Linden (1993) notes in her work on the narratives of Holocaust survivors, “interviews necessarily manipulate memories, for memories are always constructed in light of the present” (p. 83).

be willing to forward my recruiting letter to their students. A few of the instructors agreed to my request, but I did not get any response from their students. The emails to the international student associations yielded a handful of responses that eventually led to an interview with one student. I ended up focusing more on staff and administrator interviews that semester while I waited for responses from students.

I returned to my research in Fall 2013 after a summer spent in China, ready to step up my efforts to recruit international students. This time I targeted ESL courses, but I supplemented my request that the instructors forward my recruiting materials to their students with a request to let me visit their classes to talk briefly about my research and distribute my recruiting flyer. Several of the instructors agreed to forward my recruitment materials to their students, and four ESL instructors allowed me to visit their classes. After the classroom visits I was contacted by eight students (one of whom was a graduate student and therefore not eligible for my study), and I interviewed five of them in November 2013.

Shortly after an introductory interview with the last of the five students, I experienced some events in my family that ended up distracting me from the project for the next several months. When I was ready to take up the research again in Fall 2014, I decided that, for a number of reasons, it would be better for me to start fresh with a new batch of student participants. I felt that too much time had elapsed to continue working with the original batch of students, and I was not sure that they would be available or willing to continue their participation. I had learned after I had started those original interviews that the students had been promised extra credit by one of their ESL instructors for volunteering to participate in my research. Since this external motivating

factor was no longer present, I feared that the students might not be interested in continuing their participation. I also thought that it might be better to work with students with whom I already had a relationship and a level of trust. Even if students from those initial interviews agreed to follow-up interviews, I would most likely have had to start over in the trust-building process. It takes time to develop trust, though time is no guarantee that it will develop. For these reasons, I decided to use that original set of interviews to add to the complex portrait of the varied paths that international students take to UU as well as to my troubling of the categories of international student and domestic student; but I sought new participants for a series of in-depth interviews.

I taught a course on intercultural communication in Summer 2014 in which a majority of the students were international students. I got to know most of the 75 students in the course personally and, a few months after that course ended,²⁷ decided to invite several students to participate in my study. I sent individual e-mails to 23 students from 4 countries (China, Korea, Japan, and Iraq). Six of the students responded to my e-mail messages, and I was able to interview four of them. All four of these students are from China, though, as will be seen in Chapter IV, both their paths to UU and their experiences here have many differences. Two of the students also consented to being shadowed for a day, though due to difficulties in scheduling and receiving consent from the students' instructors, I was only able to shadow one of the students.

I felt very comfortable working with these four students whom I had already gotten to know and with whom I think I have a good level of mutual trust and respect.

²⁷ It is important to note that I never mentioned a need for research participants during the course. This email was the first time I attempted to recruit students who had been in my course, which had ended—and for which grades had been submitted—months earlier. I had no undue influence over the students and there was no conflict of interest.

Because they had all been in my intercultural communication class, I knew that we had a shared language and set of concepts regarding culture. I also knew something about their backgrounds and about their interest in intercultural learning. All of these factors may have made it easier for the students to open up to me in the interviews.

All of the students that I interviewed are listed in Table 1, along with information on their home country, first or dominant language (L1), date they arrived in the USA followed by the state if not Utah, major at the time of the interview(s), year at UU at the

Table 1.
Undergraduate Student Participants

Pseudonym	Age^a	Home Country/ L1	U.S. Arrival	Major	Year at UU	Research Participation
Pam	18	China/ Mandarin	Aug 2013	Biology	2 nd	2 interviews shadowing
Amber	21	China/ Mandarin	Aug 2013	Accounting	2 nd	3 interviews
Dan	22	China/ Mandarin	Spring 2013	Biology	2 nd	2 interviews
Nancy	20	China/ Mandarin	Summer 2012 (MA)	Chemistry	3 rd	1 interview
Kamon	*	Thailand/ Thai	Aug 2011	Accounting	2 nd	1 interview
Xuefang	*	China/ Mandarin	Aug 2011	undecided	3 rd	1 interview
Fenfang	*	China/ Mandarin	Fall 2011 (NY)	Marketing	1 st	1 interview
Zhong	*	China/ Mandarin	Aug 2012	Economics	2 nd	1 interview
Donghyun	*	Korea/ Korean	2007 (NV)	Computer science	3 rd	1 interview
Jiyeong	*	Korea/ Korean	1996 (NY)	TESOL Cert / Linguistics	1 st	1 interview

^a I do not know the exact ages of the participants marked with an asterisk (*), but Jiyeong stated that she was around 40, and the others were all in their late teens or early 20s at the time of the interviews.

time of the interview(s), and research activities that they participated in. The names listed here and used throughout this dissertation are pseudonyms either given by me or selected in consultation with the participants. More information will be given about these students' backgrounds in Chapter IV.

University staff. In order to respect the confidentiality concerns of several of my participants, I will not be providing individual biographies of the university personnel who worked with me. I am combining the categories of administrator, staff, and faculty and referring to them all in this dissertation as *UU staff*. As such, I will not always identify the exact role of the participant that a given quotation comes from. When it is necessary to distinguish the sources of quotations or other references to data, I use the letters A–J to refer to them as, for example, *UU staff A* or *staff participant F*. Here I give a general description of this group of participants and how they came to be involved in this study.

My UU staff participants were drawn from the ranks of tenure-line faculty, associate instructors, department heads, program directors, and associate deans. They work in the library, four departments in three different colleges, and two other administrative units, including one of the colleges with the highest number and percentage of international undergraduates (as declared majors) and a college that enrolls a high number of IUGs in general education courses and courses designed specifically for L2 English users. Among my interview participants are UU personnel who work almost exclusively with international students and/or L2 English users and those who work with a mix of international and domestic students.

All 10 of these participants have international experience beyond mere tourism,

ranging from brief work or study abroad experiences outside their home countries while they were students to extensive experience living and working outside their home countries. Most of the participants are proficient in at least two languages. Some of the participants are now or have been in intercultural relationships. Three of the participants were born and raised outside the USA.

These participants have been at UU from a low of 2.5 years to over 30 years. They have all been working in their disciplines for over 5 years. Several of the faculty participants have been recognized by their departments, the university, or professional associations for their teaching.

Additionally, some of the participants held more than one role (e.g., faculty and administrator) with several of my interviews with them focusing on both of those roles. I achieved my aim of talking to a range of people meeting the following criteria: (1) some faculty and staff who worked with mainly international students and some who worked with all students; (2) faculty from departments or colleges with courses that enrolled high numbers of international students, including faculty members with differing levels of international and intercultural experience, knowledge or training related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students, and knowledge or training regarding language and language learning or acquisition; (3) administrators and staff who created, directed, or implemented programs or policies related to internationalization and international students; and (4) people who had been involved with Presidential Task Force on Internationalization and with the Global Strategy Blueprint.

After identifying potential UU staff participants based on the four sets of criteria listed in the previous paragraph, I contacted them by email inviting them to participate in

my research. In a few cases, I sought formal introductions via email to staff members that I did not know personally. This was a particularly important strategy for gaining access to faculty outside my college (Ball, 1990). In other cases, I had permission to use the name of someone who had recommended that I talk to a particular individual in my initial email invitation.

Reciprocity. Research can at times feel like a selfish act. My participants have given much to me—their time, their thoughts, even bits of themselves. It was very important to me to find ways to give back. I attempted to do so in a number of ways, including information sharing, volunteering at campus events, and assisting students, and I always ended every interaction with my participants—face to face or via e-mail—with a repeated offer to help them in any way that I could.

When appropriate, I shared nonconfidential information with my participants. For example, I let students know about upcoming events and about services or opportunities they may not have been familiar with. I also shared information with UU staff about campus developments in internationalization or other things related to their areas of interest, such as workshops and professional development opportunities at the Center for Teaching and Learning where I am a graduate fellow. I also wrote recommendation letters for two of my student participants, and I gave feedback to one on her transfer application essay. With other students I spent time after our recorded interviews chatting, acting as a cultural informant and as a friend. Lastly, as I describe in the “Observations” section below, I volunteered at some events held through one of the offices that serves international students.

Data

In this section I describe my orientation to research data. I address the kinds of data I worked with and how I worked with them, with respect to data construction, data management, and data transformation. To contextualize this discussion, I list my research questions again here:

1. How do study participants describe their experiences as UU students, faculty, administrators, and staff in a culturally and linguistically diverse university context? What dilemmas are evident in those experiences?
2. How do participants conceive of the internationalization of higher education? How do they see internationalization playing out at UU?
3. What are the discourses that help shape and are shaped by the participants' conceptualizations and experiences of IHE?
 - a. What subjectivities are ascribed to, taken up by, and resisted by the international undergraduate participants at UU?
 - b. How is language talked about and used among the participants at UU?

Data Construction and Management

The terms *data collection* and *data gathering* call to my mind a situation in which the researcher's role is to mine for and collect data (more or less stable "truths") that pre-exist her inquiry/intervention and in which this process has little to no effect on the data—i.e., the data are relatively unchanged by the researcher. This view has ties to foundational thinking—that research participants will have stable, coherent senses of self; that they will be able to encode their experiences and meanings in transparent language that the researcher can record and (unproblematically) decode; and that the knowledge

obtained will be “true” if the researcher can just find the “correct” methods to collect and analyze the data. In keeping with my constructivist ontology, I am practicing reflexivity and acknowledging my active presence in every step of the research process, even when the words come from others. My view, then, is that the activity that I have engaged in is more accurately portrayed by the term *data construction*. (This view of data construction is also in line with Holstein and Gubrium’s (2003) perspective on knowledge construction in active interviewing as opposed to the traditional view of interviewing, which I discuss below in the section on interviews.) I employ this term to capture the fact that my participants, the texts, and I have worked together to co-construct the data, and I in turn constructed interpretations of those data.

My data are in the form of documents, audio recordings and written transcripts of interviews, field notes, and a reflexive research journal, and I have kept track of data construction events in a research log. The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed by me. I did many of the transcriptions within a week of the event, but some transcriptions were not completed until much time had elapsed after the interviews. I always transcribed any previous interviews with a particular participant before preparing for and conducting a subsequent interview. All of the formal (i.e., planned and scheduled in advance) interviews were semistructured, meaning that I did not have an identical script or protocol that I used and exactly adhered to with each participant. Rather, I had an interview guide for each interview, which took the form of a list of interview topics and guiding questions (Hatch, 2002) matched to my research questions or to questions that came up from previous interviews, observations, or document review; useful examples of prompts and probes; and space to take brief notes. This format allowed for

the interviews to take shape based on my negotiation of meaning and topics with each participant.

In keeping with my belief that an objective or value-free stance is not possible, I endeavored to take an empathetic stance towards my research participants (Fontana & Frey, 2008). I demonstrated respect to my participants by listening to them; respecting them as knowledge holders/creators and showing them that I wanted to learn from them and with them; and doing my best to treat them all as individuals rather than essentializing them as representatives of their nationality, sex, ethnicity, or other identity categories. I was also sensitive to the power relation inherent in the interview–respondent relationship (Mishler, 1986) and therefore engaged in reciprocity as described above and in the form of disclosure of some of my own views and experiences, as appropriate. I also invited participants to initiate topics and ask questions during the interviews and to review the transcripts that I emailed them.

Documents. I searched for documents that could help me understand (practices and) conceptualizations reflected in the discourses of IHE; international students; and language teaching, learning, and use at UU. I reviewed University and college mission statements; reports and white papers on internationalization efforts at UU; minutes from meetings regarding internationalization; articles about internationalization or international students in University publications; international recruiting materials; demographic data on international student admission and enrollment and foreign language (FL) enrollment; websites for FL departments and courses; international or global course requirements; websites for international research and services; and so forth. Much of the reading I did contributed to my understanding of the background and context

of IHE at UU, but only a few documents were selected for inclusion in my formal data analysis. These include the UU Mission Statement, The President's Global Strategy Blueprint (2013), the UU Strategic Plan (2012), the Report of the Presidential Task Force on Internationalization of the University (May 2006), and the Progress Report on Internationalization (November 2006).

Interviews. My approach to interviewing stems from my researcher stance described above. It is what has been called *active interviewing* (Fontana & Frey, 2008; Holstein & Gubrium, 2003). Traditionally, interview respondents have been viewed as sources of pre-existing information (even unchanging “truth”) that can be tapped with the right kind of careful questioning. In the active interviewing perspective, they are reconceptualized as productive sources of knowledge. The interview itself is “an occasion for constructing, not merely discovering or conveying, information” (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003, p. 73). My role as interviewer was to activate schema and, thereby, activate/induce narrative production and diverse possible responses.

All of the interviews were conducted at locations negotiated with the participants and recorded with a SONY ICD-SX712 IC Recorder (digital recorder). All of the UU staff interviews took place in the participants' private offices with the door closed. I conducted a total of 17 formal interviews with 10 UU staff. These recorded interviews ranged from 26 to 106 minutes in length, averaging 65 minutes. The IUG interviews all took place behind closed doors in private offices, meeting rooms, or classrooms in the main library on campus. The 14 interviews with 10 different students ranged from 38 to 68 minutes, averaging 52 minutes.²⁸

²⁸ The interview times indicate the length of the recorded interviews and do not include pre- and post-recording discussions.

I began each initial interview with questions about the participants' background and then moved on to substantive questions on my interview guide. Topics of interest were pursued when they came up, whether or not they had been on the interview guide. Follow-up interviews began with me asking the participants if they had any comments about the first interview or any comments, questions, changes, or additions to the transcript of the previous interview. I then asked any questions I had from the previous interview—clarifying responses, asking for examples, probing for more development of the responses. These questions were often indicated in the transcripts that I sent to the interviewees prior to the follow-up interviews. I also asked about things that came up in interviews with others or that were triggered by my informal observations and interactions with people at UU. Then I moved on to any questions I had not gotten to in previous interview(s) and any other new questions I had. I ended the interviews by asking the participants if there was anything else they wanted to talk about or anything they thought I should know or hear from them.

Observations. As a member of the campus community where I carried out the research, I took on a quasiethnographic stance, using my day-to-day informal observations to provide context for my research and spark ideas for new people to talk to or themes to pursue. To get a feel for some of the activities on campus, I conducted informal participant observations at a few campus events. These events included campus-wide international-themed activities, informational events or workshops for international students (including international student orientation), and workshops for faculty. Like the document research, participation in these events helped to deepen my understanding of the context of internationalization at UU. They also served as a form of reciprocity—a

way of thanking some of my participants by volunteering at events that served or were sponsored by them or their offices.

The other form of observation I carried out was to “shadow” an international undergraduate for a day on campus. I accompanied Pam to all of her classes, lunch, and one postclass campus errand one day in October 2014. I took field notes during and after the observation and then conducted a follow-up interview at Pam’s earliest convenience, 3 days later. This observation served two purposes: (1) it allowed me to get a firsthand sense of “a day in the life” of one international undergraduate at UU, and (2) it provided Pam and me with a shared context to talk about in the subsequent interview.

Reflexive research journal. This journal was a place for me to record my thoughts, impressions, question, feelings, and so forth. It was also the place where I recorded reflexive entries. Reflexivity, as I see it, involves me as the researcher recognizing myself as a being-in-the-world and turning my gaze onto myself as part of the subject/object relationship (Schwandt, 2001). This view is what is often referred to as *self-reflexivity*. Reflexivity also involves an awareness of the politics of representation and, as Pennycook (2001) noted, a constant questioning or “restive problematization” of the research process, of knowledge and ways of knowing, of language and categories. This approach can be extended to include Pillow’s (2003) reflexivity of discomfort, which involves the kind of questioning that Pennycook advocates while recognizing the messiness and contradictory nature of research. Like Spivak’s (1988) strategic essentialism, this move to a reflexivity of discomfort “challenge[s] the representations we come to while at the same time acknowledging the political need to represent and find meaning” (Pillow, 2003, p. 192). I began recording entries as I wrote the initial proposal

for this dissertation and continued through the entire process of reading, questioning, analyzing, interpreting, and writing this dissertation.

Research log. I created an Excel workbook in which I kept track of all of the data collection events, including the nature of the event (e.g., interview or observation), who was involved, where and when it took place, and how long it lasted (Hatch, 2002). I also recorded the type of data produced (e.g., transcripts of audio recordings) and when and how I shared or discussed the data with my participants.

Data Transformation: Meaning Construction and Problematizing

Description, analysis, and interpretation are all involved in what Wolcott (1994, 2009) calls data transformation. My approach to working with the data was an iterative one. I began analyzing data early in the construction process, rather than waiting until I had all the data in hand to begin the analysis. This initial phase of analysis was not as rigorous as the later meaning construction and interpretation phases. It involved mainly listening to interview recordings; reading interview transcripts, field notes, and other documents; and writing what Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (2011) call in-process memos and self-reflexive entries in my journal. As a result, this phase of analysis allowed me to capture early hunches and insights so they did not become lost over time or in a mountain of data. It also allowed me (1) to make sure that the data I had were helping me to answer my questions, (2) to discover gaps in the data, and (3) to identify a need to alter my questions or modify my methods. I was then able to evaluate my performance as an interviewer and observer and make adjustments as needed in subsequent interviews and observations.

In line with my blended (post)critical approach to this study, the approach I used

for meaning construction combined elements of what Hatch (2002) refers to as inductive, interpretive, and polyvocal analyses along with genealogical discourse analysis and a poststructural problematizing of both the data and my own constructions and processes. Inductive analysis begins with open coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) or coding texts without a priori codes. The goal was to identify themes in the data. Interpretive analysis is concerned with constructing interpretations of meanings that are grounded in the data, and polyvocal analysis derives from the desire to give voice to multiple perspectives. Discourse analysis reveals power/knowledge relations and the subject positions they open up. Combined, these forms of analysis helped me make sense of the participants' experiences while also enabling me to identify discourses and question assumptions and categories.

I used the Atlas.ti software for Mac (v. 1.0.21) to help me manage the data, coding, notations, and memoing. My analysis–construction–interpretation–problematization process was iterative, but it flowed generally as described in Emerson et al. (2011) from reading to open coding to analytic coding to memoing. As they put it, “from reading comes coding and writing memos that direct and redirect attention to issues and possibilities that require further reading of the same or additional [texts]” (p. 173). I began by rereading transcripts, field notes, and documents and then engaged in open coding. I followed the constant comparative practice (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) during my initial open coding and later theoretical coding, comparing coded segments within and across interviews with a single participant and also across participants and other texts. I also engaged in reflexive comparisons of my own views as well as my interpretations of my participants' views. The themes I identified then served

as the basis of memos, which were then reexamined, integrated, and developed further into Chapters IV and V of this dissertation.

Trustworthiness and Trouble

The traditional evaluation criteria of quantitative research are not applicable to qualitative research. I, like many other researchers, make no claims to objectivity or neutrality and no attempt to generalize my findings. Several alternatives have been offered to the traditional notion of validity, and feminist poststructuralist researchers have troubled the concept. Lather (1986) uses the Freirian concept of *conscientization* in her praxis-oriented catalytic validity, which she defines as “the degree to which the research process reorients, refocuses, and energizes participants toward knowing reality in order to transform it” (p. 272). This form of validity is very much in keeping with the criticalist project. My hope for the current study is that participants and readers alike will experience a greater awareness of their own and others’ experiences as university students, faculty, and administrators in a culturally and linguistically diverse context, and that this increased awareness will then spur action. Action may involve expansion of programs, policies, and behaviors that promote learning and are associated with positive experiences; it may also involve changes to practices that are less successful or even harmful.

Lather (1993) also suggests a *transgressive validity*. The task, she says, is to “generat[e] new practices of validation that do not rely on a correspondence model of truth or assumptions of transparent narration” (p. 675) and “mov[e] the discussion of validity ... to criteria grounded in the crisis of representation” (p. 686). She plays with the idea of validity as she considers “what it means to rupture validity as a regime of truth”

(Lather, 1993, p. 674). Her *paralogical validity* appeals to me for its interest in “foster[ing] differences and heterogeneity via the search for ‘fruitful interruptions’” (Lather, 1993, p. 686). Following Lather’s invitation to question and rupture regimes of truth, I critique one alternative to validity that is frequently encountered in the qualitative research literature: triangulation.

Triangulation involves using multiple sources of data, methods, researchers, or conceptual frameworks in an attempt to examine or verify data and conclusions (Schwandt, 2001). I embrace Richardson and St. Pierre’s (2008) rejection of triangulation in favor of their notion of crystallization. The problem with the triangulation metaphor is that it might be said to presume a fixed point (a Truth) to be triangulated. Crystallization makes no such assumptions. Crystals have many sides and many different formations. Just as qualitative research practices “make the world visible. ... [and] turn the world into a series of representations,” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 4), crystals reflect and refract light, yielding colors and patterns visible where none were visible before. These resulting colorful patterns resemble a mosaic.

The text that I have pieced together from my data construction and transformation processes is a mosaic—a methodological mosaic (*bricolage*) and a vocal mosaic (polyvocal text). It is but one of a number of potential mosaics that could have been or still could be assembled. The pieces that I have constructed and chosen (and left out), and the way I have assembled them, formed the mosaic that is a representation of my interpretations of my participants’ interpretations—the refractions and reflections—of their realities and my attempts at alternate readings of the data. Like a mosaic, it is not a complete picture—there are gaps and cracks, and the individual pieces that make it up are

diverse in size, shape, and color. The process of constructing and assembling the “finished” product is fraught.

I have attempted to trouble some terms and concepts in this research, but I have also been troubled. Chief among my concerns have been “how to be respectful of my participants, manage my interpretive responsibility as a researcher, and engage in an ethical practice I [can] live with” (Childers, 2011, p. 346), and “how to manage the responses of these participants without romanticizing or demonizing them” (p. 348). Additional concerns have included my ability to understand and fairly represent the views and experiences of international students (I do not share their language or their cultural background) and the fact that by focusing on the category *international student*, I may be missing out on important aspects of intersectionality—the interactions and potential conflicts among race, gender, and class and the roles they play in subjectivity and the social and political domains. I have worried about essentializing the experience of international students with no regard to the contributing roles that the race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, and so forth, of the individual participants may play in their experiences as university students. In an attempt to resolve some of these concerns, I remind myself and my readers that I am not attempting to construct a category of people ([international] students) that I can represent as a coherent whole with shared beliefs and experiences. Rather, my aim has been to explore the individual experiences and conceptualizations of individual members of the UU community and identify some of the discourses that they take part in constituting (and resisting) as they are constituted by them.

This use of the category *international student* represents another source of trouble.

I am reminded of Talburt's (2000) struggle with framing her work around an identity category (sexuality) "embedded in a humanist project" (p. 3) while interrogating that category with her posthumanist interpretive framework. This tension is described well by St. Pierre and Pillow (2000), who note that humanism is the "mother tongue" for all of us, "a discourse that spawns structure after structure after structure—binaries, categories, hierarchies, and other grids of regularity that are not only linguistic but also very material" (p. 4). These words have remained with me as I have interrogated the use—including my own use—of *international student* (and other words and phrases) as a lexical label. This reflexivity—so poetically described by Foucault below—serves not as a resolution to my troubles, but as a way of living with the discomfort (Pillow, 2003).

Never consent to be completely comfortable with your own certainties. Never let them sleep, but never believe either that a new fact will be enough to reverse them. Never imagine that one can change them like arbitrary axioms. Remember that, in order to give them an indispensable mobility, one must see far, but also close-up and right around oneself. One must clearly feel that everything perceived is only evident when surrounded by a familiar and poorly known horizon, that each certitude is only sure because of the support offered by unexplored ground. (Foucault, 2007, p. 127)

CHAPTER IV

UU STUDENT AND STAFF EXPERIENCES AND CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In this chapter, I present findings that address Research Questions 1 and 2. The aim is to blend my interpretations with the participants' voices to create a polyvocal text. In the first section I present descriptive and interpretive accounts of participants' experiences as part of a linguistically and culturally diverse community at the University of Utah (UU). In the second section I describe their conceptualizations of the internationalization of higher education (IHE). Lastly, I focus on IHE at UU as evident in select UU documents and as discussed and evaluated by the participants. Woven throughout are considerations of the dilemmas that UU community members experience when IHE is viewed in the framework of diverse cultures of learning and cultural synergy (Jin & Cortazzi, 2001).

International Student and Staff Experiences at UU

I begin this interpretive account of the experiences—as shared with me by the participants—of international undergraduates and of university staff with brief descriptions of the paths the students took to the University of Utah. In addition to giving context to their experiences at UU and their views on IHE, these stories serve at least two additional important purposes. First, they illustrate the diversity among students who are

at times represented as a more or less monolithic group. The second purpose, which is related to the first, is that they serve as an introduction to a point that will be taken up further in a later section: the contested nature of the categories *international* and *domestic* student.

Following the stories of the students' paths to UU, I present the findings on their experiences as students at UU, drawing on my interviews with all of the students and my experience shadowing one of the students. This section ends with my findings on UU staff experiences, also based on interviews.

Student Paths to the University of Utah

International students are sometimes spoken of as though they constitute a monolithic group. But even among the small group of students I interviewed—all from east Asian countries—there is a tremendous amount of diversity. Taking into consideration the differences in their educational backgrounds, their paths to UU, their self-identities, and even their citizenship status helps to trouble the categories of international versus domestic student. I begin with accounts for Amber, Pam, Dan, and Nancy, who are the main student participants in this study. I also include accounts from six other students—Xuefang, Zhong, Fenfang, Donghyun, Jiyeong, and Kamon—to provide a richer picture of the diversity in backgrounds of students who self-identify as international students at UU. These accounts are summarized at the end of this section.

Amber. Amber is an accounting major in her 2nd year at UU. She is from Shaanxi province in northwest China and is a transfer student from a Chinese university. Amber learned independence from a relatively early age when she left her family to attend boarding school outside her hometown in China for junior high and high

school. But she had no dream or even plan of studying abroad, so she did not spend much time learning English. To her, English was only necessary for people who wanted to be English teachers or translators, neither of which appealed to her, so it was not a subject that she took very seriously.

In her last year of high school, Amber's father learned about a study abroad program from a friend. A university in Shaanxi had just started a new program that would help students transfer to schools in Europe or North America after 2 years of study in English, general education, and courses related to the students' chosen majors. Both Amber and her father thought this sounded like a good opportunity for her to learn more about the world and gain new experiences, so she applied and was accepted into the program. Thus, she took up the identity of second language (L2) English learner and future study abroad student along with the identity of university student.

In her 2 years at the Chinese university, Amber took courses in her financial management major, a TOEFL preparation course, and a few general education courses in English, which were a big shock at first. She understood very little both in the lectures and the textbook. But she credits that experience in China with helping ease her transition to the all-English medium environment of UU. "If I didn't have any experience like that? Maybe I will start, start out like start from zero. I need to like, ahh, maybe, maybe the- I won't catch up that fast I guess" (Amber II, 87.1²⁹). The extra time she put into studying English independently no doubt also contributed to her success.

²⁹ In this chapter, quotations from participants are followed by identifiers that include the name (in the case of students) or a letter (in the case of staff participants, e.g., "UU staff B") of the participants, a Roman numeral indicating the interview the quotation comes from (i.e., here a *II* indicates that the quotation comes from the second interview with Amber; in cases where there is no Roman numeral, only one interview was conducted with that participant), and Latin numerals represent where the specific quotation can be found in the interview transcripts in Atlas.ti. In this case, *87.1* indicates that this is the first quotation I made (i.e., the first segment of text I selected to code or comment on) in the 87th document I added to the project in Atlas.ti.

Amber worked hard in her courses and, in spite of the difficulty she experienced with her first textbooks and lectures in English, she did well in them and on the English exam—so well, in fact, that the agent who handled the transfer applications for the program had to make special arrangements for her. Apparently the articulation agreements that the agent had arranged between the Chinese university and foreign universities did not include top ranked schools, so they had to explore other options for Amber. She wanted to come to the USA, which she reported associating with a hazy notion of freedom, but had no specific destination in mind. With application deadlines looming or passed for many schools, a decision had to be made quickly. Both the top 100 ranking and the late application deadline made UU an attractive choice. Amber applied, was accepted, and matriculated in Fall 2013. She was soon to learn that she would be spending more time at UU than she had expected because most of her credits did not transfer.

Pam. Pam is from Fujian province in southeastern China. She is a direct admit as an international student. There was an international program in her high school, but it was for students planning to go to university in Canada; consequently, she did not take part in it. Her father had a lot of input into her decision to come to the USA and, specifically, to UU. He had a friend in Salt Lake City so he knew there would be someone here to watch out for Pam.

Pam mostly prepared for her study in the USA independently. She took a 2-week TOEFL and SAT preparation course at a large well-known proprietary English school in China one summer. Other than that class, she studied on her own and even navigated the entire university application process unassisted—at her father's insistence: "I wanted to

use those agent to apply schools but my dad just like, ‘you should do it yourself. It’s your, your thing your dream. You should do it all by my own- all by yourself’” (Pam I, 92.3). She said the process was so difficult that it was a good thing that she had not taken the *gaokao*—if she had, she may have given up on the idea of studying abroad and instead gone to university in China.

After she was accepted by UU she enrolled in another English course to help improve her speaking. But she found that the course did not really help her, despite the fact that there were L1 English-speaking teachers. In fact, she reported that the teachers themselves told her that her level was higher than their program and they did not think they would be able to help her much. She elected to stay on because she had already paid her fees, but the only benefit she derived from the course was the friends she made there.

Dan. Dan is in his 2nd year at UU and is majoring in biology. He is from Shanxi province in northern China. He made the decision to come to the USA to attend university after he had graduated from high school. He said that he did not do very well on the *gaokao*³⁰ and was worried about his college prospects. It is not clear whether his decision to study abroad was prompted by his *gaokao* score.

His parents wanted him to go abroad immediately, but Dan felt that he needed time to prepare. He took 2 years after high school to do so. He attended biology courses at a local university as a nonmatriculated student in order to increase his knowledge in his intended major. He also enrolled in English courses—both exam preparation and

³⁰ *Gaokao* is the common name for the National Higher Education Entrance Examination in China—the exam that is taken by all high school students who intend to go to university in China. It is administered only one time each year as a 3-day exam in June. It is a high-stakes exam as it is the deciding factor for university admissions. As such, students—and their teachers and schools—are under a tremendous amount of pressure to perform well on the exam. They spend much of their time in high school preparing for the exam—the entire 3rd year of high school is solely dedicated to *gaokao* preparation. Students who do not plan on taking the *gaokao* can take a high school diploma exam at the end of their 2nd year.

conversation courses—for 9 nine months.

Nancy. Nancy is from Jiangsu province in eastern China. When Nancy was in high school, her father decided that she should study abroad. His friend had a child who had gone to the USA on one of the Kaplan pathway programs, so after learning more about the Kaplan U.S.–Sino Pathway Program, he decided it was the right choice for Nancy. So after 2 years of high school, she took the exam for her diploma rather than staying on for a 3rd year to prepare for *gaokao*.

While happy at the prospect of leaving high school behind and trying something new, Nancy felt some trepidation at the thought of living away from home for the first time. She headed to Suzhou in the spring of 2011 where she spent nearly a year in the Kaplan preparation program. There, while getting used to living in a new place away from her family, she had intensive English courses as well as 1st-year college courses taught in English: chemistry, calculus (I and II), American studies, and introduction to engineering. She spent the summer of 2012 in the Kaplan program in Boston. She did well in the preparation program and felt ready to be a student at UU when she left Boston. But when she arrived at UU, she lost her confidence and began to feel very anxious and filled with self-doubt.

Xuefang. Xuefang is from Hebei in north China. She had just started her 3rd year at UU when I interviewed her and was considering majoring in marketing, but she was still undecided. When she was in high school, Xuefang decided that she would go abroad for university. Consequently, she spent just 2 years in high school and did not take the *gaokao*.

After high school, she attended a 1-year international program at Renmin Daxue

(People's University) in Beijing, where she studied English and learned about U.S. culture. She then entered the Kaplan Global Pathways Program and applied to both UU and the University of Oregon. She chose UU because many of her friends were going to UO, and she decided she wanted a fresh start.

In retrospect, Xuefang regrets her decision not to take the *gaokao*. She feels like she missed out on an important rite of passage: “It will let you grow up in one night after *gaokao*. [...] It's really good for you- be a, adult” (11.16).

Zhong. Zhong was in his 2nd year at UU when I interviewed him, and he was majoring in economics. He is from Shandong province in eastern China. He described himself as a student athlete in high school and said that in China, student athletes did not focus on academics. He spent 4 years in high school rather than the usual 3 years. He said he did not do well on the *gaokao* and was afraid that his score coupled with his poor academic record would severely limit his options for higher education in China. His best option, he felt, was to study abroad.

Like Xuefang, he attended the study abroad preparation program at Renmin Daxue for 1 year, and he used an agent to help him apply to university in the USA. His chief reason for coming to UU was that he is a Utah Jazz fan. He knew little about UU before coming here.

Fenfang. Fenfang was a marketing major in her 2nd semester at UU at the time of our interview. She is from Shandong province in eastern China. She originally came to the USA on an F-1 visa, but she recently received permanent residency (sponsored by her mother, who had been in the USA for 9 years).

Fenfang attended an international high school in Qingdao and went to New York

after she graduated. The only preparation she undertook was to try to learn something about New York City. Her first 2 years were spent in an intensive English program at NYU, and then she moved to Utah on the recommendation of some friends she met in New York and to join her twin sister.

Donghyun. Donghyun is from Seoul, South Korea. He is majoring in computer science and was in his 3rd year when I interviewed him. Although from South Korea, much of Donghyun's education has been elsewhere. He went to middle school in Shenzhen, China, and high school in Las Vegas. Like Fenfang, he entered the USA and started at UU as an international student, but he received his green card last year. His family is now in Los Angeles, where his father works as a visiting professor. They wanted to come to USA to secure a better education for Donghyun's younger brother, who is on the autism spectrum.

Jiyeong. Jiyeong is from South Korea and has a BS in education and business from a Korean university. She worked as manager in a private English school in Korea. It was always in the back of her mind that she might study in the USA some day. She first came to the USA with her husband, who is also Korean, in 1996, spending several months at Long Island University in New York before going to Utah State University in Logan. She moved to Salt Lake City when her husband got a job here.

Jiyeong took a class at UU 10 years ago, but then she had children and decided to postpone further education. At the time of the interview she was considering returning to school. She was starting with the TESOL certificate program and was thinking about majoring in linguistics for a second bachelor's degree or a master's degree. She had originally planned on spending about 2 years in the USA, but now she has been here for

17 years. She is a permanent resident of the USA but she considers herself to be an international student due to her English skills.

Kamon. Like Donghyun, Kamon studied outside his home country before university. Unlike any of the other students, he is a dual citizen of Thailand and the USA. He was born in Utah while his father was finishing a PhD at UU. He was 2 years old when the family returned to Thailand where he was educated through middle school. His parents had known for some time that they wanted him to go abroad for college, perhaps to the USA. So they thought that attending high school in an English-speaking country would help him improve both his English and his chances of getting into university. While he was still in middle school, they enrolled Kamon in extra English courses for a year to prepare him for high school in New Zealand.

It would have been too expensive to stay as an international student in New Zealand for university, so Kamon applied to UU as a domestic student, which his dual citizenship allowed him to do. As such, he was required to take the SAT, but he also decided to take the TOEFL because he saw himself as an English learner. He had all of his score reports sent to UU and described his background on his application. When he arrived at UU, he noticed that other students at orientation had received placement information for writing courses, but his paper was blank. He was then sent to the Testing Center to take the ESL Writing Placement Exam. Having satisfied the requirements for residency, by the time of our interview Kamon was considered a Utah resident and was able to pay the in-state tuition rate.

The accounts of the paths that the student participants have taken to UU are summarized in Table 2. These brief stories serve as a reminder of the diversity of

Table 2

Summary of Study Abroad Preparation and Paths Taken to UU

Name	Path to UU	Comments
Amber (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Took <i>gaokao</i> [see note 1] after high school Transferred to UU after 2 years in a 2 + 2 program at a university in China 	UU was not one of the cooperating schools in the 2 + 2 program, so many of Amber's credits did not transfer
Pam (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not take <i>gaokao</i> Attended brief SAT and TOEFL prep courses before applying to UU Attended summer English conversation course before arrival in USA 	Pam is the only student I talked to who did everything on her own without the aid of an agent, a pathway program, or an international program in her high school or university and without previous international experience.
Dan (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Took <i>gaokao</i> after high school Studied biology 2 years as non-matriculated student in China Took oral English & exam prep courses in China 	Dan is unique among the students I interviewed in having focused on disciplinary knowledge in preparation for coming to UU.
Nancy (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Took high school diploma exam; did not take <i>gaokao</i> Kaplan U.S.–Sino Pathways Program: 1 year in China + summer session in Boston before coming to UU 	Did well in Boston summer program but struggled in 1 st year at UU
Xuefang (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not take <i>gaokao</i> Attended 1-year preparation program at Renmin Daxue Admitted to UU through Global Pathways 	Regrets not taking <i>gaokao</i> as she views it as a rite of passage to adulthood that she missed out on
Zhong (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended an extra year of high school in China Took <i>gaokao</i> Attended 1-year preparation program at Renmin Daxue Agent assisted with college selection and application 	He focused on athletics over academic in high school so he took 4 years to complete his courses. He was afraid that his poor academic record and <i>gaokao</i> score would limit his options for higher education in China.

Table 2, continued

Name	Path to UU	Comments
Fenfang (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended an international high school in Qingdao • Came to the USA on an F-1 visa and studied in an intensive English program at NYU for 2 years • Moved to Utah to join her mother and sister • Received a green card 1 year before the interview 	Her mother had immigrated to the USA several years before FY arrived here.
Donghyun (Korea)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended middle school in China & high school in USA • Admitted to UU as an international student but received a green card last year 	His family immigrated to the USA to seek better educational opportunities for his younger brother, who is on the autism spectrum.
Jiyeong (Korea)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended school in Korea • Received BS in education and business in Korea • Came to USA in 1996 as an international student, studying in New York and USU • Relocated to SLC for husband's job • Received a green card • Started back to school 1 year before interview but undecided as to course of study 	Although she is a permanent resident and has lived in the USA for 17 years, she considers herself to be an international student due to her view of her proficiency in English.
Kamon (Thailand)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admitted as a U.S. domestic student owing to his dual U.S.–Thai citizenship • Attended high school in New Zealand • Had 1 year of extra speaking & listening lessons at an English program in Thailand before going to NZ 	<p>Hybrid identity: Took SAT (as a domestic student) and TOEFL (as an English learner). He explained his background on his UU application.</p> <p>At orientation, his writing placement information was blank, so he was sent to the Testing Center to take the ESL Writing Placement Exam.</p>

experiences among and differences in the backgrounds of students. It is important not to overlook the differences and not to essentialize students based on their membership in or self-identification with a single category. These stories are also interesting in that, in spite of the fact that I had issued a call for participants for international undergraduates, which I defined as F-1 visa holders, several of the students who responded to the call were actually either citizens or permanent residents of the USA (and some were not matriculated undergraduates). Despite their legal status, they—Fenfang, Kamon, and Jiyeong—self-identified as international students for various reasons that will be explored in Chapter V. In this dissertation, I use the terms *students*, *student participants*, *international undergraduates/students*, and *international undergraduate/student participants* to refer to all 10 of these participants.

International Student Experiences

This section is an attempt to represent some of the ways that particular international undergraduates (IUGs) have experienced being IUGs at UU at a specific time. It is not a claim to truth or reality at UU; it is an attempt to understand and represent the realities that these individuals experienced and related to me. It bears noting that I have not attempted to capture all of the experiences of IUGs or even of these particular students, nor do I intend these accounts to be generalizable to or representative of other IUGs at this or other universities. What I have included here are some of the salient themes that emerged in my analyses of the student participants' initial experiences at UU, challenges they have faced and strategies they have employed to overcome the challenges, and their interaction with others.

Expectations and initial experiences at UU: “Everything is different; everything is new.”

When I just came here it was so hard for me at first. And it was like I couldn't I couldn't understand what people are talking about, and especially in class the professors they are talking about jokes, I don't get it. And (laughing) and it was embarrassing cause everyone was laughing it was like, wow, w- what's so funny? (laughs) yeah. And and it's like and the food or something are totally different so it's kind of tough at first. (Amber I, 26.7)

Although they are successful students now, many of the international undergraduates said that being a student at UU has been harder than they expected it would be. Most of them did not really have a clear idea of what being a student at UU would be like before they came here. They saw depictions of American students and college life on television and other media but knew they were not realistic. In some cases they had been told by friends that they were lucky to be going to study in the USA because they would be so free and have so much fun; however, these were friends who had never been to the USA. Perhaps this latter view is based on their experiences of education in China, where university life feels like a break after the stress of high school and the pressure of *gaokao* preparation, combined with their constructions of American “freedom.” These students prepared in the various ways described above before coming to the UU, but they did not really have a clear idea of what they were preparing for. In some cases, they were in for a bit of a surprise.

“The first day I was so disappointed [both laugh]. It's so different with, with, with what I'm thinking you know! I was picturing, like, ‘oh wow, I will fee- I will have a better life in America. I will I will eating and playing all the time’” (Amber II, 87.51).

Amber was disappointed because she learned from her advisor that she would not be able to transfer credits for many of the courses she took in her 2 years at university in China.

This meant that she would need to take more courses than she had expected, bringing an abrupt end to her vision of a carefree college life.

Her second shock came in her American history course where it was so hard to understand the lectures and the book—even after struggling through a history course in her preparation program in China. This time, her professor did not speak Chinese so all the content was in English with no chance for supplementary explanations from the professor or opportunities to ask questions to the professor in her first language (L1).

Dan's biggest surprise came where he least expected it. He had spent so much time learning biology in university in China that he thought his biology classes would be easy. They have turned out to be the hardest classes for him because of the large amount of specialized vocabulary. He also found that there were not many other Chinese students majoring in biology, so he did not have classmates with whom he shared an L1 or culture to study with. "It's hard. Yeah in the first year. Uh, because, there is, less international students studying biology (laughs). So most of most of my classmates is Americans" (Dan I, 93.29).

Like Dan, Nancy thought she was well prepared before she started at UU. She had done well in the Kaplan program both in China and in Boston, but she was very afraid when she started at UU and found that she had completely lost confidence in herself and her ability to succeed. She had a difficult 1st year and did not do well in her courses. It was not until the summer, after two semesters here, that she began to regain her confidence. She is still trying to make sense of why she felt the way she did then and why that first year at UU was so hard for her. She characterizes herself as lacking confidence at the time and the experience as being very emotional.

Social and cultural differences also resulted in a few surprises. Before coming here, Amber had expected Americans to exhibit the same level of curiosity and interest in international students as she and her compatriots showed to foreigners in China. She had not counted on the fact that the USA, as an immigrant nation, has had a more diverse population for a longer time than China has. She recounts a few examples of American students interacting with her out of their interest in China, but by and large her experience has been different than she expected.

In addition to her academic and linguistic preparation in China, another factor that aided Amber's initial adaptation to student life at UU was the presence here of a student who had come through the same program in China the year before. He helped her arrange a homestay in the same family where he was living and advised her on classes to take in her first semester. These kinds of connections may be of particular importance for students who come from education systems that offer fewer choices to students in terms of majors, programs, and courses. Several of the students described that, in Thailand, China, and Korea, students are often told which courses to take. Knowing this, I was curious to learn more about the differences between the educational system and academic culture of the places they had previously studied and those that they were experiencing at UU.

Adjusting to a new educational system and academic culture. I asked many of the students about how it felt to have to choose many of their courses and arrange their own schedules. The participants tended to view choosing courses as positive yet overwhelming, at first. Over time they acquired strategies for selecting courses, as well as for getting into the courses and sections they wanted.

Nancy reported being confused initially about which classes to take. But she quickly learned that there was information available to help her choose her courses. She reads the publicly available student evaluations and even previews course syllabi, when available, to see what the expectations and assignments are for a given course. She looks for courses that have assignments and assessments that she knows she can do well on, such as take-home quizzes rather than timed in-class assessments. This type of activity shows that she has an awareness of her own learning styles, as well as an understanding of how to navigate the system at UU.

Fenfang relies a lot on input from friends to choose her courses—another indication of the importance of having a social network. Coming from an educational system that did not allow students to make such choices, she was surprised. She described being very happy that she could choose her own courses, even if she was a little confused at first. Dan also likes arranging his own course schedule. He likes the flexibility of taking as many or as few courses as he wants each semester and not being locked into a fixed schedule that is the same for all students, as it was in his experience in China. When Fenfang is not sure about which course or section to select, she turns to her network of friends for recommendations. Interestingly, she said her advisor does not play much of a role in her course selection process. Although she meets with her advisor every semester, she does not ask for advice concerning courses because she said that advisors do not really know about the different professors, their classes, and teaching styles; other students know those things. So, she listens to the suggestions that her advisor gives her, but she bases her final decisions on information from her friends.

Of course the danger is that friends do not always provide reliable advice. Amber

tells the story of advice she got from another Chinese student that turned out to be questionable. The student who had transferred to UU the year before her from the same university helped her with both the logistics of registering for courses online and selecting courses. He recommended that Amber take an introductory course on American history in her first semester at UU to fulfill one of the general education requirements. As noted above, that course turned out to be very difficult for her, and she later learned that her friend had failed it his first semester. A UU staff participant I interviewed confirmed that the course has a reputation for being very difficult and that academic advisors generally advise their students not to take it in their 1st year. In fact, some advisors even recommend that students wait until their senior year to take it (UU Staff F, 84.64).

Even so, some students actively resist the advice they are given. In the semester that I interviewed and shadowed her, Pam had registered for 17 credits against the advice of her advisor. She said her advisor feared that load would be too heavy and that she might not do well. She talked to a friend who was also an L2 English user, had also taken 17 credits in one semester as a 1st-year student, and did not have any problem with it. “Sometimes you need some challenge,” she said (Pam I, 92.14). She registered for the 17 credits and ended up doing well in all her classes.

These examples illustrate the importance of social support networks for students and also the importance of advisors building relationships with students so that students will trust them, and so they can learn more about the individual needs and abilities of their advisees. Of course for advisors to have the time to get to know their students on an individual basis, universities need to invest resources in advising.

The students mentioned several differences between the new educational system

and the ones they had experienced before coming to UU; some of the differences made their adjustment difficult. The most salient differences were the overall structure of the system; the behavioral norms for students and teachers; and the orientations students, professors, and advisors have to teaching and learning. These differences reflect and shape the values of the cultures in which the educational systems are embedded.

Amber draws a sharp contrast between education in China and in the USA. In China, more effort is put into studying for the college entrance exam while in high school. It is not uncommon for students there to be in school for over 12 hours per day, 6 days per week. After working so hard through high school (and in many cases in middle school), university is seen as a break. She was somewhat surprised to learn that it was different in the USA.

In China the the education system is totally different. When we were in high school it was so tough for us. And, once you just stepped into the university, it's freedom (laughs). Because, I it's like you don't have to be nervous all the time you can have fun and, I when I was in in China in the university we were just like hang hang out with my friends, on weekends and just like, even in weekdays (laughs). If we don't have school. And we and we we don't like study a lot. We only study before the test. We don't study a lot. And and the teacher like, they won't like make us so hard. They will like ah give us a range to to review or something like that. So it's it's not hard at all. But here it's like, I it seems like I just came came back to high school in China. It was so hard. At first. But now it's it's getting better. (Amber I, 26.9)

The notion of scheduling was also mentioned with respect to classes. One student lamented the fact that classes were scheduled at times when there would normally be a lunch break in her home country and that during the summer session most of the campus dining facilities are closed by early afternoon, making it difficult to find something to eat after a long day of back-to-back classes. UU students are expected to fend for themselves, which is more acceptable in the individualist culture of the USA.

Many students commented on the relative freedom that students have here in the USA. They are free to choose many of their courses, change majors, or even to start or return to university at a later age. Dan commented on how surprised he was to see older classmates, some of whom even occasionally brought their children to class. He views these differences in a very positive light. Like Fenfang, he likes the freedom to design his own schedule:

When I came here, you can choose any course you want. But in China, if you choose the major, the four years every class is scheduled. You cannot change. And, I don't know why there are, maybe, uh, three- uh six or seven subjects, per semester in China. But here, if you [...] think I- you should slow the learning you can you can choose two or three class. [...] I like it. It's more freedom. Uhh, you- you can choose whatever you want. Yeah. You can, speed fast or just slow down your study. (Dan I, 93.10/24)

However, he misses the sense of community that is developed in the cohort style of education—or what have come to be called living learning communities in the USA—that is common in Chinese schools and universities:

I like [the American education style], yeah. But, for the, life? Maybe I prefer a Chinese style. Because, mmm, in Chinese college, so, it's it's not individual- p- students are not individual. They have groups. If you choose this major, they will divide you different groups. Every group have the same class. Uh, same same schedule, yeah. And you live together, yeah. Just like big family. It's, I like it. Yeah but here, you live individually. You you you can have friends in the dorm, but they are taking a different major. They're taking different classes. You go different ways. So ... How to say? Mm ... You cannot be reliable anyone in America. You just, should, live by by yourself. (Dan, I, 93.27)

Donghyun also said that student groups are a very important part of Korean education, too. Students form groups based on interests and the universities provide space for them to meet. The groups are ostensibly for studying, but the actual goal is social networking. This networking is important because the main purpose of higher education in Korea, as Donghyun explains it, is to prepare for and find a job in a good company

after graduation.

UU does have several options for students to join cohorts or living-learning communities, but it is not clear how well known those programs are among international students. One of the UU staff participants informed me that a new BlockU program—a cohort program that is designed around a theme and allows students to fulfill their general education requirements in their 1st year—is being designed specifically for international students, so that may provide students like Dan the sense of community that they desire as well as a little more structure and support during their 1st year, when they are adjusting to everything that is new and different.

Many students commented on the heavier workload in their classes at UU compared to typical college courses in their home countries. In China, for example, for most courses students only need to take a final exam. In rare cases they might have to write a final paper. Here, by contrast, they often need to complete many assignments for each class over the course of one semester. This increased workload means that they need to be good managers of their time. For students who went through high school in China and Korea the heavy workload is nothing new; but here, as Dan noted, they need to rely on themselves to get the work done outside of class rather than during study periods with a teacher.

Relationships with teachers and classmates are another difference that may make adjusting to a new educational system difficult. The students often framed these differences in terms of respect. Their perceptions were that students show more respect for teachers in Chinese, Thai, and Korean classrooms, whereas teachers in the USA seem to respect their students more than teachers do in their home cultures.

That's the difference between American teachers and (laughs) and Chinese teachers (both laughing). [Chinese teachers] will tell you the truth. Just like, you know in that class a lot of students they are not good at English. They just want to go abroad. So the teacher just step into the classroom, classroom and said, 'I've already saw you guys' the English test, and the result. So, maybe half of you you cannot go abroad because (laughs) your English is so terrible.' (Laughing) and but 'but maybe you can try it,' just like that. You know. [...] I don't know why but, but here the, the teachers just they they don't want to hurt students, yeah. More humanity I guess. (Amber II, 87.4)

The culturally scripted ways that students show respect to teachers in China and Korea include sitting quietly in class, listening to the instructor and not speaking or asking questions. These very behaviors—ways of being a good student in China or Korea—are often interpreted differently in the USA, as we will see in the next section. Here, students may be expected to participate in class.

In China the teacher will, will not give a chance for you (laughs) to talk like to challenge him or her and like yeah. It's like, basically they just like talk and, 'do you know this answer well this answer is blahblahblah' (both laugh). Yeah that kind of thing. Not like, this the professors here like really ask you what's the answer. And there are no students in China really like, say some things, say ah say something about the answer or how to break down this problem yeah. So that's kind of different. (Pam I, 92.35)

Expectations for participation (e.g., whether students are expected to listen and remain silent, to ask questions and voice opinions, to interact with classmates) show different orientations to learning. Changing such deeply ingrained behaviors can be difficult for many students. As some of these students noted, however, it is not always necessary to change this particular behavior. Many of the undergraduate classes here are large. As one student put it, the professors "just kind of go through and pretend that there are no students, and they just walk around and talk to themselves then kind of like just scan through the 200 students" (Kamon, 3.41). In smaller classes there may be some discussion, but even then, the students say, it depends on the instructor. My observations

shadowing Pam (and my experience of HE in the USA in general) generally support this student's perception.

Not all of the adjustments that the students have needed to make have been difficult. Several students commented that it has been easy to interact with their classmates, especially when they are given the opportunity to do so. In general, they find their classmates to be friendly and helpful. In addition, the content of many of the math and science classes has been easy for these students, covering material that they already learned in high school. As Dan put it, "knowledge is not a problem for me. The problem is language and culture" (Dan I, 93.43).

Challenges: Language and anxiety. Perhaps not surprisingly, language was most often named by the international students as their biggest challenge, and some UU staff agreed: "It really is a language barrier. If there's any kind of barrier where the, international students have more of the, of you know a challenge or, you know they have to make up for more. It's really the language more than the general knowledge about the topic" (UU Staff Participant H, 94.7).

The students talked about difficulty with vocabulary—particularly in reading but also on exams and in lectures, speaking, and writing. Academic vocabulary, organization, and tone (in business correspondence) seemed to be their greatest concerns with respect to writing.

The vocabularies were too hard and the you know the professional words and and I got feedback it's like I use maybe I need to use more academic words, in physics. Yeah. And and yeah. I think I think that's the, I think that's the drawback. And, um the other classes, mmm, I think just like, I think the most [part? hard?] thing is, [...] grammar or the organization? Maybe it's like, we have different logical thinking? Yeah. So maybe that's the point, I guess. (Amber I, 26.23)

Sadly, several of the students said they do not get much feedback from their professors to

help with their writing development. “I hardly get feedbacks. It’s like, we we we always do our paper at the end of semester, and and we will get the score and, and we were like, finish this class. And maybe we won’t get anything back” (Amber I, 26.21). To mitigate the lack of feedback she receives from her instructors, Amber will often get feedback from the Writing Center before turning in a paper. Less frequently, she will meet with a professor to get a clearer idea of the expectations in terms of content and organization.

Interestingly, students mentioned difficulties with both listening and reading comprehension only in terms of vocabulary; however, when faculty talked about their perceptions of L2 English users’ language difficulties, they often talked about reading difficulties more holistically. The students talked about reading difficulty in terms of vocabulary and the time to look up words in dictionaries. This difference may indicate that the students need to develop more reading strategies, as one UU staff member recommended.

Another problem associated with language use is anxiety. It was very hard for many of the students to overcome feelings of anxiety when they spoke to their professors. “I think that the hardest thing is like, uh, to actually in- interact with professors. Yeah because whenever I want to talk, I I would like hesitate like, I need to organize my words and, I I’m afraid they won’t understand me. So I, it’s yeah that was hard” (Amber I, 26.43). Amber wanted to position herself as an intelligent person, but she also wanted to avoid awkwardness or loss of face for both herself and her interlocutor. Pam reports a similar feeling, which seems to have had a longer-lasting impact:

I am afraid that I- the professor the professors won’t an- ah, understand me when I was asking (laughs) his- asking questions. I mean I never tried to ask him but, I was kind of nervous if, what if he doesn’t understand me or something like that. So when I was first- just came here, and, yeah so. Then that became a habit or

something. Yeah so I tend to not ask questions to professors. (Pam II, 90.38)

Dan talked about the monologues he had to perform in his theater class. He experienced some performance anxiety, as many students might, but for him that anxiety was multiplied by worries over his English:

Cause for me, more pressure is I need to speak correctly. So sometimes I need more do more research about the about the play cause for like the sentence I need to, figure out, 'Eh! Which word I need to stressed.' Like okay humor sentence. I I should know, 'Eh! Where's humor? How do I perform that?' (Dan II, 96.10/28)

In spite of the anxiety, he feels that the course has contributed positively to his English development (and cultural learning). But, for all of these students, anxiety represents another hurdle to overcome on top of their cultural conditioning not to speak in class.

Responding to challenges: Strategies. The IUGs employ a range of strategies to help them adjust to life at UU, learn, and overcome challenges. They all seem to be aware of many of the resources available to them at UU, and many students spoke favorably of their ESL courses, particularly mentioning the writing courses. Kamon, for example, talked about learning how to write in a deductive style for the first time in his ESL courses at UU. He found the instruction and practice he got on the structure and organization of writing in this style so helpful, and came to like it so much, that he said he would follow the same structure if he were to write in Thai, even though Thai academic writing does not ordinarily follow a deductive, linear structure.

Fenfang also talked about what she learned in her ESL writing courses and how different the approach to writing is here compared to what she learned in school in China. She was initially surprised to learn that what had been considered good writing practice in China was considered cheating in the USA. In China, she said, teachers think you are a really good student if you copy from a credible source because you are showing that you

are well read. “Before the ESL classes I had no idea about cheating. I really had no idea about cheating” (Fenfang, 13.8). She described the way she learned about the concept of plagiarism and how to avoid it in her ESL writing course:

I started to write paper and my professor [...] said, ‘This is cheating. You cannot copy that.’ I said, ‘Oh why!? Because you know, China if I use that, the teacher will very happy about that,’ you know? He said, ‘This is U.S. If you copy any-somebody else paper, right, the sentence from somebody else, and without quotation them, you will like cheating. The the system will like, [...] they will remember that.’ But I, I had no idea! But after that I think, ‘oh maybe if I copy somebody else saying, I have to quote them. [...] That’s not cheating. If I don’t quote someone, they will think that this is you copied from other people so, yeah. Right now I know so if I wan- really want to use someone else information, I will quote from. (13.8)

At the beginning she felt very uncomfortable writing in the American way, but she is getting used to it now in part because she has to write a lot for ESL and business courses. She still seems to be struggling with the reason that plagiarism is considered cheating here, but she knows now that it is and that she needs to quote and cite the sources that she uses in her writing.

The students also demonstrate initiative in seeking out resources when they need assistance. Several of them mentioned using the Writing Center for assistance with their writing, and the students who found that the Writing Center did not meet their needs found other ways to get help with their writing, such as free or low cost tutors through campus tutoring services, help from friends, or help from their professors. Often, one unhelpful experience was enough for the students to seek alternatives. For example, Donghyun gave up on the Writing Center in favor of a private tutor; Pam turned to her friend for physics help after the TA could not answer her question.

For their part, UU staff reported that a relatively small percentage of all of their students—international and domestic alike—visit their office hours or seek assistance on

papers or discuss their exams. Some of the students I interviewed admitted that they seek help from friends more often than from faculty. The reasons they gave for not seeking help from faculty were either (1) their impressions that the faculty were too busy or (2) their office hours were not convenient (i.e., they have other classes during scheduled office hours). In addition, anxiety about their language skills, as mentioned above, also at times kept students from seeking help their professors, though many said they were more likely to seek help from a TA.

Another strategy that students used to respond to challenges was seeking out or creating opportunities to use their English more, such as taking part in campus activities to interact with more people, talking with homestay family members or roommates, and even attending church services and events. In addition to these social strategies, they used a range of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. For example, they often previewed vocabulary to make sure they would be able to understand lectures and discussions in class. They made use of any slides or lecture notes that their instructors made available to them in a few different ways: they previewed (when available) them to prepare for class, reviewed them to study for exams, and even used them as a guide to focus their reading. The students also reported taking notes strategically rather than trying to write down everything. They are flexible in their strategy use depending on the task.

For exam you need to, you need to review, you need to practice, you need to memorize. Yeah. It's quite boring. Yeah. But for paper you need to, if you have no idea about this background or this, theory you need to, search research. Yeah. You open broaden your mind, yeah. Yeah in the- you need to look some things. (Dan II, 96.7)

They also exhibited strategic use of their linguistic resources through translanguaging. Students reported reading related texts in their L1 to help them understand texts in

English, and they discussed course concepts with classmates and friends in their L1. One student even reported using her L2 (English) for L3 (Spanish) learning.

Interactions with faculty. On the whole, the students had many good things to say about UU faculty. They described faculty as being nice, patient, humane, respectful, and very busy. They really appreciate that most faculty are available to help students after class or during office hours and that once they overcome their anxiety, they are easy to talk to. They related a few negative incidents they had experienced or witnessed related to culture and diversity and offered a few suggestions to help faculty.

Students find it very helpful when lecture notes or power point slides are available online. It is very helpful for students who want to preview the material or vocabulary before class or to review the material after class, particularly if there was something they did not catch or did not understand. One faculty member I interviewed said that she had received good feedback from students when she has done this. Another student mentioned taking advantage of feedback sessions with faculty or TAs after exams, so she can see what she got wrong and what she needs to review. She never had this opportunity in China and really appreciates having it here.

Two students described how helpful it was to be able to ask instructors about words they did not know on exams. They said that their instructors were very patient in answering their questions about terms on which they were not being tested, which probably reduced any test anxiety they were experiencing. One of the faculty members I interviewed also mentioned that he answered several of these types of questions during exams and did not mind at all when students asked them. However, another faculty member said she would not answer questions during a test. Instead, she gives all students

the option of bringing a dictionary to the exams.

Less successful interactions with faculty were also reported. One student told the story of insensitivity that a faculty member showed to one of her Chinese classmates.

That student was quite vocal in class, but when the professor did not understand one of her questions he handled the situation in a way that made many students uncomfortable:

Once she asked the question and professor didn't understand. And there was American next to her, and the professor said, 'why not you just translate it to me.' Like, that. And the girl was like, wow. Yeah. And she was sitting like, right, in the corner. So the professor said, 'if you want to ask a lot of questions, just sit in front of the classroom. That way I can understand you.' And then, 'maybe, you- just like, point to the, the American guy, "maybe you can, you can talk to me what she's talking about.' So. Wow it was quiet in the classroom. (Amber II, 87.26)

Experiences like this one may contribute to students' anxiety about their language skills and lessen their participation in all classes, not just in the class where the incident takes place. Amber articulated this point, which came up in other interviews, too: "So the that's why it's hard to like, ask questions in the classroom. Once they don't understand you it will waste other students' time you know" (Amber II, 87.26). In an earlier interview, and as discussed above, Amber had mentioned that overcoming her language anxiety in order to be able to speak to her professors was her biggest challenge during her first semester here.

Another incident related to faculty interactions, which I will briefly introduce here and take up again in the section on language and culture in Chapter V, took place in an ESL writing class. Pam was writing a paper on whether Cantonese was a language or a dialect, and she used a source written in Mandarin Chinese. She related how her native culture and language were devalued when her instructor told her that she could not use the source because it was written in Chinese.

I was like, kind of offended because Chinese culture's really really long history and really, various and, thick culture. And and why, and it has so many real good really good, [...] mottos [...] or sayings and, and they're they're much deeper [...] than English. So if you, if you don't to let me use them, how'm I suppose- how am I supposed to-, I mean it's ESL class. You need to respect other cultures. (Pam I, 92.60)

Based on their experiences at UU, the students offered a few suggestions to faculty and to the UU at large on ways to enhance student learning and promote the development of linguistic and cultural competence. The first suggestion is that faculty should give feedback on writing assignments to help students develop their writing. Some faculty do this, but many (outside the writing courses) do not. As Amber and others noted, often papers are due at the end of a semester and students receive only a final grade with no feedback. Amber's suggestion is that overburdened faculty could at least give students the option to request feedback. This would save the faculty time and allow them to focus on the students who make the request. Another language-related request is that faculty spend time defining key terms in class. More generally, Zhong identified a need for faculty to focus on student comprehension and monitor their learning. He said that in his experience ESL instructors make sure that their students can understand them, whereas other professors do not seem to do so—they just speak at a rate that seems natural for them and focus on course content.

My major teacher are mainly talk about the, yeah just like the courses or the material and uh I think their speaking way is kind of, is i- I don't know. It's kind of natural or kinda, yeah it's not- kind of free, free to talk and they can talk everything they want. And just they re- make sure it's related to the material. But the, like [ESL teachers] yeah there is kinda like, just make sure it- we can understand what they talking about. (Zhong, 12.6)

One student noted that there were a fair number of activities for students to take part in on campus but suggested that it would be nice if UU would organize some

activities that would bring faculty and students together. These activities would provide more opportunities for students and faculty to interact and my help lessen the anxiety that often inhibits participation in class. Finally, Amber calls for understanding of the different cultures of learning that students come from and patience as they adapt to the culture at UU.

Interactions with classmates and intercultural learning. I asked the students specifically about their experiences with group work, as I was interested in learning about their opportunities for interaction in academic contexts. They all reported having had experiences with group work at UU, though for some that experience had been limited to their ESL classes. Some expressed discomfort or anxiety working with American students or L1 English users, while others expressed a preference for working in mixed groups over groups of students from their own country. Though some mentioned the pressure they sometimes feel when working in a group with American students, some have also talked about the opportunity to play to students' strengths in mixed groups. Fenfang and Amber specifically mentioned handling the mathematical calculations in groups projects in their finance or accounting courses while their American group mates handled the linguistic matters. "The American guy he's really helpful. Because especially when we organize the, the paper, uh, I can do the accounting and the the numbers things and he can organize the sentences and something like that. It's really, yeah. Yeah, I guess we can do a good job" (Amber I, 26.34). For her part, Jiyeong said that she tries to find ways to contribute to the work that rely less on linguistic competence, preferring to let the L1 English users handle the linguistic aspects of the project while she volunteers to handle the labor-intensive work that others may not want to do, such as making copies

and assembling project materials.

For Nancy, most experiences with group work have been in lab classes. Beyond the experiments they do in class, she does not interact much with her partners. The out-of-class writing work is done via email and Google docs. Though she has heard about bad experiences related to group work from her friends, the only real negative experience she has had was with a group of Chinese students who did not want to redo their subpar work.

Maybe we are too familiar with, they're not so serious, like. So if we did something wrong they would- they don't like to redo it. They they would like to go. So, we did not do very well in that lab period. It's the only problem. I don't know. Because usually American students would like to redo it. But we- they don't want, and, we just leave. (Nancy, 34:12)

In her case, then, it may be more motivating to work in mixed groups. Dan also has experienced working with lab partners, and he echoes Nancy's preference for working with Americans. Though Nancy does not necessarily like to be told what to do, Dan does not mind letting his American lab partner take the lead:

If I work with, American guy, I think, work is easy, for me. Because, uh, because American lab partner is like leader, they they know everything. And I keep pace with him, yeah. [...] But if you, if you work with a Chinese guy, it's hard (laughs). Because, uh, he's not, uh, get prepared for the lab. So, you should rely on yourself. (Dan I, 93.37)

Part of the problem that Dan and his classmates have in the lab is language-related. Even if he has learned the subject-specific vocabulary, he has gaps in his knowledge of the kind of procedural language used in the directions for the lab experiments. This difficulty indicates a potential need for language support courses or materials tailored to different majors, departments, or disciplines.

It would seem that having students work on group projects would provide opportunities for intercultural learning. However, however, as Nancy noted, she does not

interact with her lab partners outside class. For Amber, Fenyang, and Jiyeong, the nature of their interaction with their group mates may not extend much beyond dividing the work and assigning responsibilities to group members. These experiences, coupled with what appear to be limited opportunities for in-class interaction, suggest that intercultural learning cannot be assumed to take place with the mere presence of culturally diverse students on campus.

When I asked the students about their own intercultural learning—things they have learned about American culture, cultural misunderstandings they have experienced, things they find puzzling, changes they have made to their behavior, and so forth—they tended to talk about nonacademic aspects of culture (e.g., American roommates not sharing things, not spending time/eating together; humor being hard to understand; friendships with Americans being shallow and not often extending outside class or beyond a semester; American and Chinese students spending their free time differently; how strange it is that adults might wear a Halloween costume all day). For the most part, they did not seem to think in terms of culture as related to their academic life or of the subcategory of academic culture. Only when I asked them to compare classes at UU to classes in their home culture did they mention the differences described above, but even then they did not frame them as cultural differences. This was most surprising to me for the students who had taken my intercultural communication class (LING 3600), suggesting that one course is not enough to develop intercultural awareness and competence.

The intercultural learning that they explicitly commented on tended to happen outside the classroom. The sources of learning that they mentioned included cultural

informants and the media. Many of the students reported that it was useful to be able to ask someone, such as roommates and homestay families, friends, or instructors, about something they did not understand. Amber reported asking her homestay family to explain jokes that her history professor made in class, and Dan asked his theater professor to explain some of the jokes in the monologues that he had to perform in class. Pam learned how American college students celebrate Halloween from her roommate. She also talked about changing her speech patterns to more closely imitate the speech she hears on television and what she hears around her.

Clearly these students demonstrated intercultural learning in academic contexts as well. They understand, for example, what plagiarism is and how to avoid it; they know that some professors expect them to participate in class; they can choose their courses and manage their schedules. But they did not explicitly refer to those things as learning about culture. More often than not, *culture* called to mind popular culture and the social world.

I also asked the students about the complementary side of intercultural learning: how interested their classmates seemed to be in learning from them and how much they thought they were learning. The kinds of interactions they had with their American peers were most frequently limited to questions about where the students were from, what their hometown was like, what real Chinese food was like, and so forth. Dan estimates that only about 5% of the students at UU are interested in learning about his culture; Pam's impression is that the majority of American students are not well informed about and not interested in Asian culture.

Other friends American friends they don't even know some something about Asia. So I was like, mmm, okay. [...] Because I want to talk about them with the, Asian things, and I was like, 'umm,' and he- they was like, 'um okay, yeah?' And yeah she don't, no they don't really know about and they don't really want to talk about

them, so. Talk about that so I was like, mm, okay, just change to another topic (laughs). (Pam I, 92.57)

This example further illustrates the point that there is much room for improvement when it comes to intercultural learning at UU.

Several students called for more activities on campus that would promote interaction among students. Fenfang, for example, stated her belief that American and Chinese students wanted to get to know one another but they often either lacked opportunities to do so or were too shy to initiate interactions, so the University needs to create more opportunities for them to meet and interact. Donghyun echoed this sentiment, calling particular attention to the language anxiety that may inhibit peer interaction in English for some students with lower proficiency in English, though he also recognized that some people simply may not be interested in interacting with people from other cultures. He said that his international middle school in China did a good job of pairing up younger or new students with senior students who mentored them and suggested that UU might consider implementing such a program. He was not familiar with the Ambassador Program and iMentor Program, sponsored by International Student and Scholar Services, which both pair experienced UU undergraduate students with new international students.

A UU staff participant also recognized that faculty need to structure intercultural learning activities and provide opportunities for students to interact because just being on campus together is not enough:

I think just by being in the same room with each other even though they're in, cont- in other classes in mixed classes, not many teachers are you know working on integrating everybody with each other. And so I, I do like bringing all that together in the [cross-cultural communication] class. That my- you know I'm forcing my Americans to work with my Chinese students and then they're

discussing- it's, you know it's meta in many ways. They're discussing this process of working with each other and trying to understand culture while they're actually doing it. But I really do like it because I think for, for both groups it's, it's transf- it can kind of transform their understanding. (UU Staff G II, 97.14)

An understanding of the different cultures of learning that their students come from, and the difficulties that these differences can sometimes engender, can help faculty create better opportunities for learning and developing linguistic and cultural competence.

A Typical Tuesday

In the previous section I presented a broad description of international student participants' experiences, noting several themes that emerged in my analysis of the data. In this section I zoom in (Wolcott, 2009) for a focused look at a single student's experiences in a single day at UU. My experience shadowing this student allowed me to develop a better sense of a typical day in her campus life and it gave the two of us a set of shared experiences to talk about in our subsequent interview.

During our first meeting, Pam consented to allow me to shadow her for a day on campus. She subsequently shared her class schedule with me, and she recommended potential dates for the shadowing to take place. She was taking four classes that semester: one large lecture course that met Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays; two other lecture courses that met Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays with attached discussion sections meeting on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and a small language class that met Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. I decided to shadow her on a Tuesday, as that would allow me to accompany her to a variety of courses: lecture, discussion, and language. We then had our follow-up interview on Friday of the same week. Table 3 shows Pam's schedule for the period that I shadowed her.

Table 3
Shadowing Schedule

Time	Course/Activity	Location	Course Format
9:40–10:30	1000-level General Biology	Large auditorium	Lecture
10:45–11:35	2 nd -year Spanish	Small classroom	Presentation & practice
11:40–12:45	LUNCH BREAK	Student Union	
12:55–1:45	2000-level Physics, discussion section	Medium classroom	Lecture + homework problems
2:00–2:50	1000-level General Chemistry, discussion section	Large auditorium	Problem sets
2:50–3:30	Chatting & campus errands	Campus	

I contacted all of the instructors on the Friday before the target date requesting permission to attend the classes with Pam and explaining my purpose. I received responses granting permission from all four of the instructors over the weekend. Pam lives in a residence hall on campus and we agreed to meet around 9:30 on Tuesday morning, just outside her first class. I had both an iPad and paper and pen to take notes during my observations.

The day got off to a rocky start as Pam was late to the first class and I was delayed by a train that was 15 minutes late. We ended up entering the auditorium where the biology course was held from different sides so we did not sit together. As it turned out, there were no opportunities for student interaction in that class, so I only missed being able to observe when Pam took notes, and I was able to ask her about that during our follow-up interview.

Pam described this day as a typical Tuesday with the exception of the fact that she was late to her first class:

I think it's a- usually my typical day on Tuesday and Thursday (laughs). [...]

Biology, well about that I was like, because Tuesday I was late so I didn't really- and I was sat back at the gate so I wasn't really concentrate on the course. But I was looking for the slides the professor had already gave us [on Canvas].... And I just looked looked it up and review some questions for the quiz. So I didn't really listen to him (laughs). And for the Spanish class, it's like um, yeah just like every day we just listen to the topic and, try to answer the question about fill in the blanks thing and then have a little conversation with classmates. Yeah. And then it's the, physics discussion. And that is the most most boring class I have ever had. So (laughs). Yeah. So I didn't go there yesterday [Thursday] (both laugh). Because it's gonna be real boring ... he just talk about nothing. I mean I didn't learn something from here so I just, don't want to waste my time. And. But the chemistry class I have to go, so, anyways. And it's, the clicker question, mostly they're just really easy I think for me so. Yeah. And after that, I I will, do homework and go to the Fieldhouse. And that's it. Yeah. That's my- mm-hm, yeah. (Pam II, 90.4)

Here I present my reconstruction of the day from my field notes along with my interpretations of Pam's experiences based on our interview a few days after the day in question. In my analysis, I have focused on differences in cultures of learning and the potential dilemmas they invoke, opportunities for interaction classmates and faculty, and opportunities for language use.

The biology course met in a large well-appointed auditorium. It appeared that most of the 345 enrolled students were in attendance as the 348-seat auditorium was nearly at capacity. In fact, Pam sat on the floor just inside one of the doors as there were no open seats that would have been easy to slip into. The professor used both PowerPoint slides projected onto a screen at the front of the auditorium. He was wearing a microphone so it was easy to hear him even in the back of the auditorium. He was quite animated as he lectured, moving about the front of the room and even a bit into one of the center aisles at one point. This was a very teacher-centered lecture; the professor directed questions to the class and elicited information from time to time but did not call on individuals to answer. Pam confirmed with me later that this professor never provides

opportunities for students to interact with one another in class.

Though it was not on display this particular day, Pam's impression was that the professor would get frustrated when no one answered his questions in class. "He has a temper and if no one's kind of able to, ask- answer his question he will get pissed off. Really. [...] sometimes he's like, 'hey guys it's really simple! Why why can't you understand? It's like oxygen!' And he was- yeah. He is real- has a temper, really seriously" (Pam II, 90.16). She compared him to teachers in China who will tell the class they are stupid if they do not or cannot answer a question. But he also had a sense of humor at times and could be an entertaining lecturer. When I later asked Pam whether it might be helpful if the professor asked students to talk to a partner first in class—particularly during those times when no one answers his questions—she agreed that it might. Towards the end of the hour, the professor elicited information from students to build up a diagram on the board, making notes of the key concepts. The biology class ended with no particular wrap-up—no review of the day's main points nor preview of what was to come the next day. I made a note to ask Pam if it was clear to her which information was more important.

I also wondered about Pam's ability to understand his colloquialisms (e.g., he asked the class whether a particular substance was "wimp or stud") or even his speech more generally when he was speaking quickly. To me, it sounded like he said "piece of I" rather than "P sub i" (P_i) at one point during his lecture on cell metabolism, and at times I could not tell whether he was saying ADP or ATP. Given that this class took place near the midpoint of the semester, it could very well be the case that the students were already familiar with the terms and the colloquialisms that the professor used and that he had

explained them when he introduced them earlier in the semester. My experience as an observer in this class, however, served as a good reminder of the importance of (1) activating background knowledge so that all students are working on the same page and (2) working to achieve linguistically responsive teaching.

In our follow-up interview, Pam told me that her strategy for learning was to focus on the information that the professor included on his slides, which he uploaded to the online course site for students. She had found that the exams focused on the information presented in his slides, so she could disregard the rest of the information presented in the chapter and other reading materials.

He, doesn't really in- notice us that which, thing is important. But I assume that, all of things that is in his slides are important. So, yeah. I I assume that so, yeah. That's the important things that he'll pull out from his book. Because our book's written by himself. [...] So I just sometimes I'll read his slides and looking for the information in the books. And other than- the rest of the book just, [useless]. (Pam II, 90.20)

Pam and I chatted during our 5-minute walk to her next class, Spanish. In stark contrast to the large biology lecture class, the intermediate Spanish class had 24 students enrolled. About 20 students were present and nearly filled the small classroom. The teaching assistant was an L1 Spanish speaker from Argentina. He began the class in Spanish but switched to English from time to time for some classroom management tasks and to give some explanations to students about language and content. I wondered what impact that the code switching had on Pam's learning.

The day's lesson was part of a larger unit on the Spanish-speaking Caribbean. The TA followed a presentation + practice format to introduce the students to some unique features of Caribbean varieties of Spanish. He talked about the different phonological features, displayed sample texts on a PowerPoint slide with targeted forms highlighted,

and played a brief recording that contained the targeted forms. After students had read and listened to the texts, they answered simple comprehension questions displayed on the screen at the front of the class. Then they worked in pairs to read brief dialogues, using the Caribbean Spanish forms they had just learned about. Pam worked with an American woman who was sitting next to her (and whom she had greeted by name at the beginning of class). At the end of the class, the TA talked about an upcoming group project and told the students to let him know who was working with whom or if they wanted him to put them in groups.

I found myself wondering what role background knowledge might be playing in Pam's learning in the Spanish class. Pam said she had little knowledge about Central and South America and the Caribbean, but she did not think that lack of knowledge had a negative impact on her learning. She was afraid at first that all of the other students in class knew a lot more than she did, but she soon realized that most of the students seemed to have the same level of knowledge, so she was not at a disadvantage:

The first topic in this class we were talking about the, Mexico, or and then Spain, and I was like- they were talking about the, the kings and the history how they ruled the Mexican world, back in the years. And I was totally new- it's it's totally new for me, this. Ah, the blonde, the blonde guy- I don't know if you remembered her. [...] And she was totally knew about it and she talks about that in Spanish, a lot. And I was like, I was really impressed because I w- I thought I was the only one that didn't know that, but I look around and see others are silence too- in silent to so I was like, 'okay yeah. Maybe there- it's new to him, for them too.' (Pam II, 90.53)

She also had the impression that the TA had not assumed any level of background knowledge among the students. In fact, she thought much of the history was new to him, as well: "all the North American things like the history, he is not really, quite understand about that too. So I don't think he thinks all of us knew that" (Pam II, 90.53).

Though she does not see herself lacking in necessary background in the Spanish class, she does see herself as having low listening comprehension in Spanish. She identifies herself as less capable than her classmates in this respect, whereas in terms of Spanish grammar she is often surprised when her classmates seem to struggle. I suggested that the other students might not be understanding any more than she is, and she related her attempt to position herself as a good language learner by mirroring the behaviors of her classmates:

I just think the average level of other students, they're really high, I mean listening part. Because they just like, they really concentrate on the teacher when he speaks Spanish and nodded their heads, and it's like, they understand him. And I was like, oh my gosh. I don't understand a word. What I'm gonna do? I'm gonna like, fall [...] behind. [...] I'll pretend, I nod my head and try to understand, 'yeah I got you,' that kind of face. (Pam II, 90.9)

Feigning comprehension notwithstanding, Pam's translanguaging skills help her compensate for listening comprehension difficulties in Spanish by strategically listening for English:

I'm really not good at listening in Spanish. So, sometimes I just ignore what he said in Spanish because either way I can't (laughs) understand him. So I just will concentrate on what he says in English and figure out what he just said in Spanish, that kind of thing yeah. Yeah. That's how I learn, how I try to understand him in class. (Pam II, 90.8)

She also learns Spanish vocabulary through English rather than through Chinese because she said that Spanish is similar to English.

Growing up in the rich linguistic environment of China may have contributed to her translanguaging ability. Her parents spoke the dialect of their hometown, which was in a different province from where Pam grew up. Pam's education was in standard Mandarin (Putonghua), but she was also exposed to both the local dialect and her parents' dialect. Her linguistic history provides an interesting backdrop to the mini lesson on

different varieties of Spanish.

After the Spanish class, Pam and I headed over to the Union where we joined her friends for lunch. She did not eat anything because she said she usually eats a very large breakfast. Instead, she spent much of the time chatting with four friends—who were all from different parts of China and Taiwan—in Mandarin; she also asked one of them for help with a physics homework problem. For the last 15 minutes or so of the lunch break, after most of the students had left, Pam, a male student from Taiwan, and I talked about language; language learning; and the classification of dialects, languages, and language families. Pam is very interested in languages, how they developed, and how they are related. Then Pam and I made the 10-minute walk to her next class.

The physics discussion section was held in a mid-sized classroom in an old building that I had never been in before. Of 28 enrolled students there looked to be only 10–15 students present. We arrived 3 minutes late and the TA had already written several formulas and equations on the board. He continued writing more formulas on the board and, still facing the board, told students about the concepts and formulas that they needed to know. He proceeded to write on the board and talk about concepts and formulae for the next 30 minutes. In that entire time, Pam only took notes once, 20 minutes into the class period. Most of the time he spoke, the TA either looked at the chalkboard or gazed to one side of the room, above the heads of the students. With just 15 minutes remaining, the TA seemed to have finished his lecture as he stated, “okay, let’s go ahead and get started.” Several students opened laptops or tablets and the TA circulated around the room and interacted with a couple of students while they worked on homework problems until the end of the class period.

Pam and I talked later about the irony of this class being called a discussion section given that there was no interaction among students. She said that the TA mainly just repeats what the professor has already talked about in the lectures. I asked her how she felt when the TA asked the class if there were any questions, and whether she asked questions when TAs or professors ask that. She said she did not think asking that was a helpful teaching strategy because there would not be time to answer if a lot of students wanted to ask questions. If she has a question, she will usually wait until after class to ask the teacher or to ask a friend who she knows to be good at the particular subject. The one time she did ask a question in the physics discussion class, the TA was not able to answer it to her satisfaction:

The one time I asked the questions about the physics problems, and I got it right but I don't really know how I got it (laughs) right. So I asked him how did I- how exactly to figure it out, and he- and then he was like, struggling it for half the- half of the class and he still didn't give me a way. And some- and other students they have questions too and they said, 'okay can you can you move on to deal with the other questions,' and he just give up that questions and it was just like what the heck (laughing). You didn't even give me the answer! (Kris: yeah) yeah so I was like, you are not helpful. (Pam II, 90.24)

She did say that her professors were very good at explaining concepts and answering questions, but she still waits until after class to ask her questions.

The last class of the day was the chemistry discussion class. We were joined by one of Pam's friends—a young Chinese man—shortly after we took our seats in the large auditorium. There looked to be about 120 students present and there were five TAs who circulated around the room. Without any preamble, one of the TAs displayed a problem on a PowerPoint slide, which was projected on multiple screens around the auditorium. The students were encouraged to work together to solve the practice problem, with the TAs available to help students as needed. After several minutes elapsed, a TA displayed

the solution on screen and talked through a few of the steps. Then a graded problem was displayed and students needed to enter their solutions using student response system “clickers.” There were three cycles of a practice problem followed by a graded problem. The class ended just as abruptly as it had begun after students entered their responses to the last problem. Pam seemed to have no trouble with the problems and solved them relatively quickly. She chatted with her friend and with me between problems.

After the chemistry class, we talked to Pam’s friend for a few minutes and then took our leave as he headed to another class. Pam and I headed to a campus theater box office where Pam enquired about discounted tickets for an upcoming show she wanted to see. I asked her how she knew about the student discounts, and she said that when she sees a poster about a show that interests her, she goes to the website for more information. She also had learned about student events and discounts at orientation, and she learns about a lot of activities through campus housing.

In our follow-up interview, when I asked how her sciences classes at UU compared to her classes in China, Pam commented on the approach to learning. The same material was covered in her high school science classes and her biology, chemistry, and physics courses here. The difference was that in high school in China, the emphasis was on memorizing formulas and doing calculations, whereas here the professors stress the importance of understanding the concepts behind the formulas:

Pretty much what I learned in science now is kind of, what I have already learned in high school. So. Mmm, well it’s like the science class, when I was in high school, they are more concentrate about how do you calculate the, numbers. And how did you get answers. And the teacher doesn’t really teach us why do we need that. Why is the whole formula come from, and something like that. But here it’s like um, yeah. Like chemistry concentrates on more on the concepts, like the different laws and that kind of thing, and yeah. Sometimes- and biology too. It’s like, back in high school, biology is like you would just need to know how the

process, how this process goes, but you never figure out why it goes, what's inside of it. Yeah. This, that's the difference I think. (Pam II, 90.5)

She said her biology professor kept telling students not to memorize a formula or model but to try to understand it. I asked her what she thought about that.

It's kind of, depends because, you know sometimes you just need to mem- you need to memorize it. No mat- because if you can't understand it, you need to memorize it and to deal with the exam and the quizzes. But if you can understand and if you can think it, better to do better to do that. So yeah. It depends. (Pam II, 90.6)

It could be the case that there is a dilemma of context here, with Pam and the professor holding different views on the value of memorization. It seems, though, that Pam is integrating this new way of learning into her system and strategically employing approaches based on the context.

Pam described this day as a typical Tuesday for her, but I do not know how typical it is of undergraduate education or for other IUGs at UU. The things I found most striking were how few opportunities she had to interact with other students in class and how rarely she needed to speak English. In her biology and physics classes, though one was a large lecture class and the other was a small “discussion” section, the instructors created no opportunities for student–student interaction. In the social constructivist view, this lack of interaction is not good for learning. It also reduces the opportunity for Pam and other L2 users to develop their English speaking skills and for all students to get to know one another and build a sense of community in the classroom. In addition, it calls into question the opportunities for intercultural learning to take place. The other thing that most struck me was—in spite of the reduced opportunities for Pam to use English in some of the classes—the amount of translanguaging that Pam engaged in. She used her English in the Spanish class to aid her comprehension of the TA and to communicate

with a classmate, and also at the box office to seek information about tickets to an upcoming show; she used her Mandarin resources to socialize with friends at lunch and discuss the chemistry problems (and nonacademic things) with her classmate in the Chemistry class. Many of the opportunities for language use—with the exception of listening to lectures—were of her own creation.

The student experiences presented in the current and previous sections set the stage for the next section. The interplay of student and faculty perspectives bring to light dilemmas that are present when different cultures of learning come together. I have described some of the expectations that the students brought with them and how those expectations have changed over time (dilemma of expectations). The students have also talked about some of the changes that they have made to their behaviors and the suggestions they have for changes that others could make (dilemma of change). Pam gave one clear example of the differential value attached to different ways of learning (dilemmas of context and of pedagogy). These and other dilemmas will become more salient as faculty voices are added to the mix.

UU Staff Experiences: Dilemmas, Conflicts, and Opportunities

All but one of the 10 UU Staff Participants I interviewed have regular contact with undergraduate students, and for most of them that contact occurs in the classroom. I asked the participants about their experiences with undergraduates in their classes and what began to emerge was a picture of faculty who care deeply about their students and who want to be able to discharge their responsibilities to the benefit of those students. They expressed an ever-shifting kaleidoscope of feelings of frustration over behaviors that do not align with their expectations, excitement in their courses and the evidence of

learning they see, and doubt as to whether they are doing all that they can to help their students succeed.

The main themes that emerged out of the participants' accounts of their experience with IUGs revolved around their views of their roles as teachers, which are embedded in their views of teaching and learning, questions of responsibility, and questions about the role culture plays in teaching and learning. These themes overlap and interact with one another and with the dilemmas associated with cultural synergy, and they are all connected by a sense of uncertainty and equivocation.

Some of the issues that the UU staff brought up in the interviews may stem from their own misconceptions, oversights, or uncertainties. One involves the importance of background knowledge. A UU staff member admitted that she had never really thought about the differences in background knowledge that students may have in a humanities course she taught and what the implications of those differences might be for learning. In a course that revolved around Western mythology, what may have been safe to assume as a shared rudimentary knowledge among students at UU a decade ago may no longer be the case with so many more undergraduate students from Asian countries.

Another UU staff member who taught a course with a more narrowly U.S.-centric focus may not have sufficiently considered the potential impact that differing levels of cultural knowledge might have on students' understanding, learning, and performance in the course. Interestingly, both staff members expressed the idea that the U.S. students did not really have any advantage (or that the international students were probably not at any measurable disadvantage) because they did not really know that much about the topic—or even had incorrect knowledge. What these staff members may not have fully

understood is the importance of a frame of reference on which to build more specific knowledge from the course.

There's one part of me that thinks there is no real extra hurdle there because none of them have ever really thought about this, you know? But on the other hand I wonder how much is sort of- you've absorbed through osmosis being an American, that is way more surprising and peculiar to someone coming from Japan or, you know from, I don't know, yeah I mean Libya or something like that. I just I don't have any sense of that. It's certainly possible that there is a really strange cultural gulf there that I'm not fully aware of. And they certainly don't let me know about it, by the way. I mean nobody ever says to me, 'oh this is so different, from our legal system.' Cause I don't have the sense they know about their legal system either. You know. It's like fish don't think about the fact they're underwater. You know I don't think they think about their legal system. I don't think Americans think about their legal system. (UU Staff I, 99.12)

“I recognize my bias when I walk into a classroom [... but] I don't know how to offer them the support.” In general, the UU staff members expressed an awareness of differences across cultures of learning, even if they admittedly did not always know what those differences entailed. Yet, it is also clear that this knowledge, even combined with a recognition of one's own preference for particular ways of teaching and expectations regarding student behavior, does not eliminate the frustrations or solve the dilemmas of cultural synergy (Jin & Cortazzi, 2001). As one staff member pointed out, recognizing a bias does not solve the dilemma of context: “I do, I still, even after all this, I still place a value, a higher value on our m- methods of education, so, I recognize my bias when I walk into a classroom and what I expect” (UU Staff G I, 86. 27).

This same staff member reported an understanding that what it means to be a “good student” is culturally constructed, while still feeling (1) frustrated with some of the differences in behaviors exhibited by her students and (2) helpless when she does not know how to help the students adapt to the local academic norms.

The obvious difference that we point out as we look at our, our Chinese students

and we look at their, their ability to participate. And it's not necessarily an inability to participate, it's their, their idea of who their- what their role is in the classroom. And what their role is, and what my role is. As the teacher, the knower of all information, the giver of all information. And I see it is usually when I have consultations with them. In the classroom I can write it off and we can kind of work around it and they can work in groups and talk to each other and participate. And I can pretend, [...] that the expectations are clear and they are the kind of students who are thinking for themselves, being critical learners. And then I come to a consultation with them on a paper and at the end of our discussion about where they're at in revising their paper they say to me, 'what should I write? What do I need to change? So the only thing I need to do is this and this?' And, and then that reminds me, okay. I'm dealing with a student who in this case this student, has relied on a teacher to tell them exactly what to do his entire life, and how to do it. And that- and so, that part I feel like is, is so hard. [...] It drives me crazy because I don't know what more I can do. I don't know how to help them, I don't know how to offer them the support. Some of them want to work here, and explaining that you know, taking some of their own responsibility for how they look at their own work, not always asking for feedback, um, is valued in the American workplace. (UU Staff G I, 86.23)

She is struggling with the dilemma of change as it interacts with the dilemma of context.

To what extent are the students' approaches to learning and enacting the roles of "good students" as understood within their home cultures valued in the learning culture at UU?

Does the dominant culture at UU need to adapt to accommodate their various ways of being good students, or do the students need to change? In a parallel set of dilemmas, another staff member expressed his frustration over not knowing how to deal with participation points in his classes and what he should expect from the students.

It's something that punishes them if they, if they are not facile with it, right. If they can't do it well they're gonna be docked points on it. And I- *I'm always always troubled about that. I never know what I really ought to do and I go back and forth all the time about it. Is it appropriate to demand the same performance from people who I know full well that performance is more difficult for? On the other hand, what am I here to do? I mean you know it's- if this is what I'm teaching then, then dammit you gotta teach that! Right?* [emphasis added] Then that's that's what this is. And you gotta grapple with it and nobody made the math problems [easier] for me and I was terrible at math. Right? Like I was a person who always struggled at math. I just never had the brain for it. It was just terrible for me. [...] *Why should there be a handicap here? I mean if you're gonna take if you're gonna take a college course in America, part of what you have to learn is*

how to think like an American, right? How to be like an American if you want to succeed in America. I mean so that's the other side- that's the other voice in my brain [emphasis added]. (UU Staff I, 99.25, emphasis added)

A third UU staff member aligns herself squarely with the position that responsibility lies with the institution and the faculty to meet students where they are and address their needs. She is frustrated when she hears people express resistance to teaching students something that they “should” know already.

Are you gonna punish them for being where they are? [...] And that's not fair. And I think that that's part of that awareness too is, you know we need to come down to where the students are, and then build them up. Not stand up here and say, 'you need to come up here.' (UU Staff B, 81.1)

UU staff participants also mentioned structural impediments to the kind of teaching they would like to do or to curricula that would better support learning. One staff member spoke of her frustration with what she sees as the marginalization of culturally and linguistically diverse students and their needs. She has found it necessary to advocate for international students and L2 English users somewhat stealthily by allying with staff from other programs to reframe the issue so that it encompasses a larger portion of the UU student body.

Any time I give a presentation my title never now says language learners. Never. I never put in anything because what happens is, as soon as I do that, it's like, 'ugh, well I don't wanna, I don't want to learn how to accommodate for them.' But the truth is, the accommodations help lots of different learning styles. And so if I don't say that- like if I say, 'oh it's about memory, how your brain works, and memories.' Well then people are really interested. (UU staff F, 84.100)

Another staff member spoke of how constrained she felt by the large class sizes. She said that the lack of capacity at UU to have smaller discussion sections attached to large lectures meant that she could not do the kind of group work she could do with a smaller class. She taught in a large auditorium with fixed seating that further limited her

options for in-class group activities. There are several possible implications of these limitations. First, if intercultural learning depends on interaction, and interaction is curtailed, so then are the possibilities for intercultural learning. These large lecture courses may in the short term favor students who come from low-participation lecture-based university cultures as they may reduce the burden for cultural adjustment. But there is a danger that apparent similarity may mask difference—that students may view a lecture course at UU as being exactly the same as a lecture course in their home culture, with all the same attendant expectations for student and faculty behavior. Then there are the long-term implications, which include not only fewer opportunities for intercultural learning but also few opportunities for language use, which might slow the development of academic language competency. Finally, even in courses where faculty expect participation, it is much easier for students to “slip through the cracks,” as UU Staff I puts it, in a large class.

Finally, some UU staff may feel like they are venturing onto unsure ground if there are not support structures for faculty or departmental policies within which to work.

I never really know. I try to make accommodations for [international students] – take exams with extra time, things like that. I never really know if I’m allowed to do that or not. There is no policy in [the college] about that. [Sighs.] I’m always up in the air about it. (UU Staff I, 99.27)

“On one hand culture is underrated as to its impact, and on the other hand I think it’s also over estimated.” A lot of UU staff participants talked about not knowing where cultural and individual differences in behavior begin and end. Some behaviors that departed from the local cultural norm at UU could clearly attributed to cultural differences, but other behaviors were viewed more equivocally. With this ambiguity came, among some participants, a fear of being taken advantage of by students who were

“gaming the system.”

One participant who teaches several large undergraduate courses said that the international students in his classes “make all kinds of, what feel like annoying requests for special dispensations of all kinds.” When I asked for an example, he said he had had students ask him to raise their grades and claimed that other professors were doing so “because it’s so much harder for international students. [...] They could be lying to me. I have no sense of whether or not that’s true. It might be true. I have no clue” (UU Staff I, 99.45). He mentioned other requests from international students for easier exams or extensions on exams, and he related a few examples of several international students emailing him with very similar requests at the same time. In one case, he said several students asked to take his final exam early to accommodate the flights home they had booked, which he regarded with suspicion.

And and there are all kinds of things that I can’t tell whether or not they’re playing me. [...] Did they really buy the ticket? I have no idea. I can’t quite decide if what the- if that’s not true, what’s the scam? I I don’t know. So if I let them take the exam a day earlier, is this just a way to get your exams over sooner? In which case it’s not really that big a deal. Or is there something else to this. I, I always have the impression like I’m being [bamboozled]. (UU Staff I, 99.46)

With a palpable sense of exasperation, he also related getting

the same email, over and over and over again from different students. So they must be sharing that form, that template. Or as I said to you that thing about where I get like a bunch of students who all have the exact same excuse, and I don’t know what that means. I don’t know! (UU Staff I, 99.68)

It seems that this staff member viewed the use of a template in a negative light. In an earlier comment the same staff member had complained about receiving emails from L2 English using students that were incomprehensible, so he may have a relatively narrow range of acceptability for emails. From my perspective as a language educator, I know that students are often encouraged to write using templates and models in ESL classes, so

using a template to email an instructor might be seen as an effective writing strategy from the point of view of the students. This could be then an example of a dilemma of expectations.

As if on cue, during our interview this participant received a call from the Testing Center. One of his international students had shown up there asking to take his exam, but he had not gotten permission from U Staff I—in fact he had not talked to him about it at all. The staff member decided to let the student take the exam but was clearly agitated about the incident.

There's this part of me that really just wants to say, 'I'm sorry there are norms here. This is not the way, you get to do this.' Right? 'You never spoke to me about it and it's two days past the date you were meant to take the exam.' So it's frustrating. So, I don't know what to make of that. This is a person who theoretically could have spoken to their friends who've already taken the exam. I mean I just- [sighs] I don't know. It's deeply frustrating. [...] I mean just to illustrate the point, this is a thing that I- that just doesn't happen with my non-international students. Now listen—they have different pressures, I know that. [...] But it just, as a curiosity, interrupting this interview, it's it's a subject that I need to have to deal with because of the international students. (99.69-70)

As another participant points out, no discussion of differences among academic cultures would be complete without a discussion of academic honesty.

There is of course always a discussion on expectations regarding cheating. And, and that, the assumption is that there are some nationalities where it's quote 'more accepted,' or there is a bigger challenge with that. And anecdotal evidence that I've overheard indicates that there seems to be a greater proportion I don't know among certain groups. So then of course some people say, "well they don't understand," and then there's all sorts of orientation programs about how you need to be academically this and that and the other. [...] I actually have a sense that the concept of cheating is pretty well understood widely (laughs). But, you know, we have US nationals that also engage (laughs) in cheating. And so, so I think you know possibly there's different viewpoints on that. I don't know. Whether it is actually that culturally different, or whether it's being attributed to that (laughs). (UU Staff J, 85.34)

Another participant expressed his own frustration with cheating among international students. He posits different solutions that depend on the framing of the

problem, suggesting a dilemma of expectations. I asked for his “pie-in-the-sky” solution, and he framed the problem as one of admission standards and recruiting:

The pie-in-the-sky solution is to not allow students into upper division courses – perhaps not even into undergraduate education at all – who don’t have the English skills to thrive. That we really ought to do a better job of identifying which students can succeed, right? And that involves having proficiency with language. (UU Staff I, 99.35)

He thought that Kaplan, who had been recruiting students for UU through the Global Pathways Program, may have failed at ensuring that the students exiting their program were ready to succeed at UU. As a result, the students were being set up for failure.

An alternative solution to the problem of cheating would be to provide more language and academic support to students who needed it. He problematized that potential solution, returning to the concern he expressed earlier about the integrity of curriculum:

This gets back to that other question I told you I’m always wrestling with, right? Which is *whether or not they ought to be given a different educational experience than others students. Because they have different challenges, certainly. But is our job to teach the material the way we think it should be taught to regardless of who the student is or is our job to handicap the material for the students’ needs?* [emphasis added] And and I think we’re trying to do some kind of hybrid of that but I don’t really know where the sweet spot there- and you know the na- you know you’ve got a hybrid when nobody’s happy, right? *You know you’ve got a compromise when, nobody’s satisfied* [emphasis added]. But I don’t know, I don’t know. I mean it seems to me a baked-in problem [sighs]. And as I say I try to make certain kinds of accommodations, I don’t know if they’re sufficient. (UU Staff I, 99.41)

“One of the roles that I take seriously is [...] academic culture interpreter.”

UU Staff Participant G framed her role as teacher as being multifaceted. She sees part of her role as being a “cultural interpreter” for both students and faculty and an advocate for students with faculty from other departments. I asked how her role as cultural interpreter for her students fit with her own values regarding teaching and learning in linguistically

and culturally diverse contexts. After a big sigh, she talked about the conflict between the value she places on difference and on intercultural awareness and understanding and her perception of the context she is working in. She has chosen to be pragmatic and prepare her students—most of whom are L2 English users who are relative newcomers to Utah and the USA and are here on F or J visas—for this context, even if she personally believes that these students should not bear the sole responsibility for cultural adaptation. She rationalizes this stance by noting that the students made the choice to come here.

Well I think it it's a good question [...]. I have to take the, the pragmatic stance. I- I know that, how the larger University community looks at our students, how they understand our students, how little patience they have for our students, I know that that's not going to change. So what can I control? I can control the information I give my students, and you know I can put it in the context of, 'yes you've learned English. Yes you've learned about American culture. But now we're in the world of American academic culture, and that requires you to learn certain other skills to become successful.' And part of those are cultural nuances and social roles and, you know, notions about, how to act and. So I think, I can't- I can start to, *I can you know rectify it with my own feelings. I can put those aside because I recognize, well you came here. Right? It's not- I'm not coming to you and saying you need to do this. You have come here. You want to be successful here. If you want to be successful here here's what you have to do. At the same time, I will continue to, talk to other teachers, and try to change, the rhetoric, um, that is used to describe international students* [emphasis added]. Because that rhetoric is- sometimes it's racist, it's, it's biased, um, it's- it's not what you expect when you're in a, a university where people are- feel very liberal minded and open-minded. Um, the way they talk about our international students is often-, very narrow-minded. And without empathy. (UU Staff G I, 86.11, emphasis added)

UU Staff G's decision to embrace pragmatism—helping her international students and L2 English users acculturate while, at the same time, not abandoning advocacy for a more inclusive view of these students, their cultures, and ways of learning—occurs at the intersection of several dilemmas. She responds to the dilemma of expectations in knowing what UU faculty expect; she understands and recognizes the dilemmas of choice and context—that the students' choices are constrained by the unequal distribution of

power among the cultures of learning and the differential value attached to those cultures of learning. The dilemmas of pedagogy and change are temporarily resolved by adopting the pragmatic pedagogy that helps the students change to meet the demands of the dominant culture of learning at UU.

She recognizes the role that misunderstandings about language and language learning may play in the way some faculty view international L2 English using students. This misunderstanding may enable faculty to view one salient feature of language—pronunciation or grammar—as a proxy for a host of linguistic, pragmatic, and cultural communication issues, vastly underestimating the challenges that the students face. From this perspective, it becomes easier to view students as lazy or disinterested if all they need to do to be successful is fix their pronunciation problems.

A lot of the teachers I don't think realize that students who come here may have never been out of their country. They might score great on the TOEFL but they haven't been in the cultural context of communicating in America, in an American university. So there's a lot of vocabulary they don't have. There's a lot of pragmatic language they don't know how to use. Um. And often times they just, you know, they write it off as a pronunciation problem. I mean if you ask people who don't teach English, they say the biggest problem they have with their students is their students don't know their grammar and they can't, they don't have good pronunciation. And I kinda say, 'well, it's a lot more complicated than that.' Right? You can, you can understand somebody who has poor pronunciation if, if they have enough vocabulary or they have this. Or you can understand somebody, you can still understand an American student who has terrible grammar. Um, but I also understand they don't know. They don't know the language of our field and, how to explain it to themselves. (UU Staff G I, 86.18)

This UU staff member has framed the problem as at best misconceptions about the nature of language learning and the complex interrelationship between language and culture and at worst an impatient, biased, sometimes racist faculty who are not willing to understand and be empathetic towards international students. To deal with this problem, she employs two strategies. One is to work with the students so that they more closely

match the expectations of the dominant academic culture, and the other is to work to slowly change that culture.

That kind of rhetoric is frustrating but I also, I've gotten to the point where recognizing that it's there, and slowly trying to change it will eventually one day help my students but in the meantime the students that are here for the next four years, what do they need? They need, this, this, and this. (UU Staff G I, 86.21)

A second UU staff member related a similar misconception among faculty. She described what happened when was approached by directors of graduate studies in one college at UU with a request to help their international graduate students:

'We've got to get rid of their accent,' [they said]. [...] But when I get to what their needs are, well they're- the reason why- accent is what they can s- what they can see and hear and identify. The other things are are far, are far harder to to see. When, when I meet with them, and we find out what they really need is that they are having trouble communicating for job interviews, well accent's not the only problem. [...] We also have a number of cultural, really bad things happening, in these interviews that are that are damaging the relationships. And, so the m- the further we get into it, we find out, you know boy the- you know here are all the things that the, that the, non-native students need to learn. What was interesting though is that over time these meetings, were still always focused on, the deficits of the non-native speaker. (84.115)

Clearly, the UU staff members I interviewed are experiencing frustration as they face the inherent dilemmas when cultures of learning come together. That frustration is often rooted in a desire to help their students but not knowing how to do so. Even the faculty who specialize in working with culturally and linguistically diverse students experience doubt. "If I really thought about it I would have to like, would drive myself crazy and look at a student and be like, 'am I really helping you?'" (UU Staff G I, 86.38) But staff members also saw opportunities in their diverse classrooms, which is the final theme in this section.

"There are a lot of things you could do if you actually were committed to [intercultural learning]." Quite a few of the staff participants talked about the

opportunities for intercultural learning in classes with students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds. Our interview seemed to spark ideas in one staff member of how she might create opportunities for her students to learn from one another:

What if students had to do a class, where they interacted with international students not as sort of 'I'm the superior because I know the language,' but you could somehow equalize it, and have inter- you had to have some kind of an international (laughs) experience with, students where, you- they- you had to learn something about their culture. I mean there're really some interesting things we could do, right? (UU Staff H, 94.34)

Another staff member shared some of the positive experiences she has seen in her classroom. She relishes the moments when she sees students from different cultural backgrounds overcoming their initial reticence, building a classroom community where all of the students feel welcomed and valued, and they can all learn from and with one another.

Those moments are I think pretty exciting. When I see you know, the Chinese student who is always working with the Saudi student and then they always have this one American who comes and talks with them and they start to find out that, 'okay yeah, the nervousness we had about overcoming our cultural differences, [...] it's kind of they start to just kind of get to know each other. But that's also a big component of all my classes. This building a community within the classroom, so. Regardless of being a mixed group or being you know all Chinese students or all Saudi students, I would still be doing that. But it is it's a lot more fun to see it in action. And see what techniques work to get- to force people to talk to each other. (G II, 97.17)

I asked her about the techniques she uses to promote interaction among her students. She did not hesitate at all before recommending that instructors *force* their students to work together:

Forced group work. Um, not necessarily, projects outside of class, but creating time for them to just connect with each other, even unrelated to what we're talking about. [...] Making sure that they all kind of learn each other's names. Little things like that make a huge difference and so then like one day I watched, you know three of my Americans, [...] all blonde blue-eyed Utah kids who when they're in a group I call them Aryan nation and like I'm like, 'Yeah you guys,

way to integrate!’ and I was like, ‘I’ll have [student name] come work with you today.’ And [student name] is from Mongolia and kind of shy. And like as he walked over they were like, ‘[student name]! Come on over!’ And super friendly and like as somebody who’s here from Mongolia—it’s his first semester he’s kind of shy—you could just see that like, it made him feel a lot better. To have somebody inviting him over, using, you know using his name, was kind of a big deal, feeling included. (G II, 97.19)

In interviews with UU staff, the participants related a range of experiences in their interactions with culturally and linguistically diverse students. All of these things are taking place in a fraught, contested site filled with conflict and tension, as well as opportunity. The participants spoke in turn of frustrations they had experienced as well as positive experiences and opportunities they saw for intercultural learning at UU. The ways that they interpreted both their own roles on this internationalizing campus and the roles that language and culture play in their interactions and experiences at UU are informed in part by their conceptualizations of IHE, to which I turn next.

Student and Staff Conceptualizations of IHE

IHE is without doubt a contested concept. The proliferation of definitions and descriptions in the literature attest to this fact. It is not surprising, then, that it proved challenging for many of the participants to articulate a conceptualization of IHE. As my conversations with the participants unfolded, however, they began to express a variety of views. Some, rather than speaking about IHE in the abstract, seemed to find it easier or perhaps more meaningful to express IHE in terms of what UU was doing or could do—or even in terms of their own practices. Whether they spoke about IHE in abstract terms or with specific reference to UU, similar themes kept coming up. Most commonly, the participants spoke about IHE in terms of structures, processes, rationales, and effects. I will give a brief overview of these themes and then present summaries for many of the

IUG and UU staff participants. It is interesting to see the way their views unfolded in the course of the interviews.

Structural markers of IHE were often the first things mentioned. Student mobility—in terms of international student enrollment and study abroad—was mentioned by all of the participants. Some participants commented on the potential effects—both positive and negative—of increased international diversity in the student body, and others were adamant in their view that simply having more international students on campus would not automatically make a university more internationalized. A few participants even questioned the impact of study abroad programs, explaining that both the program structure and the individual students taking part in study abroad programs will lead to different results.

Language learning was also frequently mentioned as something that would take place in an internationalized or internationalizing university. Interestingly, though many participants mentioned language learning, very few of them talked about the use of languages other than English being part of IHE at a U.S. university. Some participants also mentioned courses on culture or intercultural communication. The responses differed in their apparent conceptualizations of culture and what it might mean to learn about culture. Many but not all of them connected learning about culture—as well as language learning and study abroad—to developing some level of intercultural competence.

Intercultural learning was conceived of as one of the rationales for IHE. Other rationales for IHE that participants mentioned (explicitly or implicitly) included academic, economic—the opportunity for a university to collect higher tuition from international students—and other institutional rationales such as global branding or profile. The latter

rationale was at times discussed within critiques of a neoliberal marketization of HE.

The final salient theme I will mention is the interesting ways that the participants spoke about IHE as a process. It was described as a complex process, with perhaps an unachievable goal. Participation in this process was contested: Should everyone participate? In what way? Should participation be voluntary or obligatory? How could it be obligatory? I will present more detailed accounts of these views from several of the participants.

International Student Conceptualizations of IHE

Amber views IHE in terms of people. An internationalized university, in her view, would have lots of different kinds of people from all over the world. It would look “like New York City” (Amber II, 87.29). This would create an interesting environment with the opportunity to meet people from many different countries, but she worried that it may be hard to make friends if there were not many people from one’s own country due to communication difficulties and the tendency she has observed of Americans not to want to make close friendships with people from other countries. The inability to make friends may then hinder students’ adjustment to college life.

Another potential drawback to increased cultural diversity on campus is that there could be more cultural misunderstandings. She brought up the potential for religious differences to spark misunderstandings. Amber also said that the universities themselves might need to change to accommodate greater cultural diversity. She gave an example of campus dining services, drawing on her experience as a university student in China, where she had a Muslim classmate. She said that they were not able to eat together due to her classmate’s dietary restrictions, but that universities in China accommodate this

difference by having a separate Halal dining facility (Amber II, 87.60). That this was such a salient point in her mind may be attributable to collectivist values in China: Meals are shared, and everyone eats from the same dishes. In contrast, in the dominant culture in the USA where people tend to order and eat their own dishes, it may be more acceptable to have one cafeteria serving everyone and to have people with very different dietary habits eating together. Among more collectivist cultures, such as China, it may not be acceptable for people to dine together but with separate dishes. There may also be face issues if people dining together cannot all eat the same dishes.

Her mention of diverse groups of people and the potential misunderstandings initially suggest that Amber is expressing a structural view of internationalization and is not conceptualizing IHE as a potential perspective or mindset, such as the global mindset one UU staff participant spoke of. But she does go on to describe the need for the development of intercultural awareness to reduce or resolve the potential misunderstandings. She stated that class dynamics would change if there were a lot of students from Asia. Many of these students would prefer to engage in class by listening and taking notes rather than by speaking, so “maybe the class will be quiet” (Amber II, 87.29). But she places the onus of intercultural adaptation mainly on the international students, because they are the ones choosing to enter the host culture. From faculty, she expects understanding of the students’ cultural differences as the students are adapting to the new culture: “that’s another challenge for professors (laughs). And and they they got to know the students’ habits. They have different kind of style for writing and reading or listening to the class. Maybe they just, they just like, taking notes they don’t like talking in the class” (Amber II, 87.33). It seems she hopes the faculty can interpret the students’

behaviors from an emic perspective. From domestic or host country national (HCN) students, she also hopes for understanding, respect, and acceptance. She stresses that this respect does not require a change in the HCN students' identities: "they still have to learn some new cultures but they can keep their original parts. Yeah just to show respect I think that's all" (Amber II, 87.35).

Pam and Zhong both noted the desirability of having a more internationally diverse student body while pointing out limitations. Although he sees great potential benefits in increasing international diversity on campus, Zhong recognizes that breaking cultural and linguistic barriers cannot happen overnight. Pam similarly expressed the view that having international students on campus does not necessarily mean that the campus is internationalized: "Though there are international students here, but, I mean the cultural the whole atmosphere is still American-style.... If it needs to be internationalized the first thing they need to, have more other elements of other cultures on campus" (Pam I, 92.46). She suggested events that marked holidays and celebrations from cultures outside the USA, and she stressed that the events needed to be publicized well to raise their profile and attendance. However, she did note that a recent celebration of a Chinese holiday did not seem to interest Chinese students on campus. They did not attend because they thought it would be boring, though it is not clear why (Pam I, 92.50).

In terms of academics, Pam believes that course offerings contribute to the internationalization of a university. She specifically mentioned language classes and classes in which students learn about and engage in research about different cultures (Pam I, 92.51). She also strongly believes that all students should learn a language in addition to their L1,

because if you want to learn a language, you you will start to learn know the, the country, and how they, how the language came from and everything like, what is going on in this country what was in this country, the history and everything the culture and, they'll get to know, the real side of the culture but not listen from any media things. (Pam I, 92.53)

So she views language learning as a vehicle to learn about a different culture in a more authentic way than access only to cultural artifacts could provide. Her own experience of seeing how different the culture is here from what is portrayed in the American television shows she watched before coming to the USA may have informed this view.

Like Pam, Donghyun mentioned increasing the number of international students as one way to internationalize a university. In fact, key to his conception of IHE is the provision of more opportunities for international students. He said that partnerships with universities in other countries could contribute to internationalization. Although he was not able to identify universities' rationale for engaging in these activities ("I don't know why universities should do that [laughs] But I like it" [14.8]), he said he was in favor of them at UU because they raised the profile of the institution, which he perceives as not being very well known in South Korea outside engineering students. When asked, he said that the potential benefits for increasing international student enrollment at UU include a financial benefit from the higher tuition these students pay (in comparison to Utah residents) and a reputational benefit. For example, when UU graduates are hired by large, multinational corporations such as Samsung, it will increase the global reputation of UU.

Dan also conceived of internationalization in terms of student mobility: bringing international students to a university and sending domestic students out on study abroad programs. He also mentioned the presence of international faculty members as a marker

of campus internationalization. He did not express any views beyond this structural level or comment on the rationale or potential impact of these structural factors. He did, however, express pride in UU for its efforts in these areas.

UU Staff Conceptualizations of IHE

One UU staff participant noted that IHE could play out differently depending on the motivation in a given context. A key component of internationalization for her is the ability to adapt, but who needs to adapt is the question. She quoted the “when in Rome” proverb and tied her expectations to her own experience adapting to different cultural norms both outside the USA (e.g., as both a participant and a coordinator of a study abroad program) and within the USA but across disciplinary boundaries, as well as to hypothetical situations (studying in another country she hasn’t been to). She noted her discomfort with an expectation for one-way cultural adjustment:

With globalization, at least from an American perspective it’s, it’s troublesome to me, and complicated because there is this huge push for internationalization and globalization but there is no expectation of our students—in fact, we’re discouraging students to study language and become proficient. But then, okay what does that mean? That the rest of the world adapts? (UU Staff B II, 30.14)

She seems to be questioning what actually happens at HE institutions with respect to linguistically diverse populations and language use.

When I asked her what it might mean for a university to internationalize or to develop the global competencies of its students, she characterized this language as “highly problematic buzzwords” (B III, 81.2). Though she struggled with articulating her concept of IHE—“to internationalize the campus I, I don’t even know what that means” (81.3)—she did say that internationalizing education should begin with requiring all domestic students in the USA to study abroad—an admittedly idealistic goal, she said.

She stressed that bringing international students to campus would not be enough to internationalize the campus and that faculty need to find ways to internationalize their courses, perhaps by “recognizing the global nature of the work” of their discipline and by finding opportunities to incorporate the knowledge and perspectives of international students. She kept returning to the idea that it is vitally important for all students to have some experience outside their home culture and to learn another language so they can engage with another culture. Without those experiences—which could presumably lead to greater intercultural awareness and competence—it is difficult to achieve what she views as another key component of IHE, which is integration of students from diverse cultures.

We want to bring the internationals to us, as opposed to going out and having that experience, outside. You know even though I think it’s important to have that mixture on campus, but because people don’t go outside of this then they don’t know how to- they don’t know what to do with them when they get here. (81.3)

So this participant, like Staff Participant G below, implies that it is important for HE institutions to have plans and systems in place to provide for international students and to reap the potential benefits of IHE.

The starting point for UU Staff H, like the previous participant’s, also rests on language study and study abroad or equivalent international experiences.

I think about internationalization as, that our students have that cross-cultural experience where, they have to in a way deal with culture shock. You know and in one sense you can only do that when you come to another- when you live in another country. But I also think you get that experience when you take another language. (94.29)

Though she recognizes the fact that not everyone will be able to travel internationally, she supports her point of view by explaining the awareness that can come from studying another language and learning about other ways of thinking, doing, and being:

Because when you study this language, especially when you first jump into a real text, it is so disorienting. It, it- your whole basis of thinking is different. And so I think of, of- that internati- being 'internationalized' is, jumping into or seeing in another culture in a way that shakes you. That defamiliarizes you. That you realize that, that things that you just assumed are normal, are not so if you were in another language or another environment. (94.29)

She argues that internationalization must involve more than just "importing" students to the campus or "exporting" wares to a global marketplace—it must involve "yourself being exported" to have the defamiliarizing, transformative experiences that create intercultural awareness and have the potential to develop empathy.

As noted in the section on UU staff experiences, this faculty member started to develop ideas during the interview of how internationalization might take place without requiring students to have study abroad experiences.

What if students had to do a class, where they interacted with international students not as sort of 'I'm the superior because I know the language,' but you could somehow equalize it, and have inter- you had to have some kind of an international (laughs) experience with, students where, you- they- you had to learn something about their culture. I mean there're really some interesting things we could do, right? (94.34)

She gave an example of having students share origin stories from their own cultures in a myths course. This kind of activity would position the international students as bearers of knowledge while also exposing all students to a range of perspectives and knowledges. Tapping into that knowledge opens a host of possibilities for learning and for the co-construction of knowledge.

There are a lot of things you could do if you actually were committed to that. That we don't just want them to come here, and, you know, they're supposed to adapt to our way but we actually interact with them and treat them, with real respect where we treat them like intelligent people not just people who can't speak English well. You know what would happen? How would that change, people's point of view if you talk about an international requirement, right? You know how would that change how people really felt about things? (94.34)

This sudden proliferation of ideas indicates that faculty members are certainly capable of finding ways to internationalize their courses and provide students with intercultural or international experiences there. I will return to this idea in the discussion in Chapter V.

Staff Participant H also offered a critique of the way IHE is sometimes conceived or enacted at HE institutions. But as she recognized her potential role in facilitating intercultural learning, she seemed to regain a sense of optimism:

But I I really do worry about this because I don't see the, the sort of global initiatives as leading to cultural understanding or exchange. I just feel like it's always this, yeah. That we want, we want to spread our name elsewhere. We want to be accepted, you know, 'Oh we have a Korean campus! Oh we have this or that.' It's not about, really understanding the Other. Or, respecting the Other. Which, I think if you ser- sincerely learn a language and try to understand the culture, there is a sympathy or an empathy ... that I think really does emerge. That- but it's hard. It takes work. And I think that's part of the problem again. These things are hard, they're not easy. Languages are really hard. And so nobody wants to put in the time. But, yeah. There is- I think there are a lot of interesting possibilities. I'm having all these ideas as I'm talking to you (laughs). You know, what could we do? (94.34)

Another UU staff participant unequivocally stated that internationalization needs to involve everyone at the university, not just international students. Integration of students is vital in order for them to be able to recognize their commonalities ("oh, you're a student too!") and build relationships. She views it as so important that she recommends forced integration—for example, including international students in the orientation programs for all students and not just separating them.

[Internationalization] has to involve the university and the university students who are already here. As a part of the process, in internationalization. It can't be put on the you know the 1200 international students here. That's a burden that they can't—that's not an achievable goal. That's not something they can do. It has to be a part, of, the University's entire- everybody has to be on board. There has to be buy-in from everyone. International students, yeah maybe they have an orientation for themselves but why aren't they in with freshman orientation? Why do we have to separate them? Um, and I think sometimes like forced, integration- when you get past these initial barriers of like meeting people, you start to they

start to, they all start to see, ‘okay we’re- oh you’re a student too. You’re a student,’ and like, ‘oh we are interested in- oh you like video games too, you like video games too.’ ... I don’t think our domestic students or most of our faculty or administration have any idea of the advantages we have, being here the things that are easy for us every day, that we put all of that burden on our international students. And, if we want to be an international university, with all these ideas and you know community building and all of those um, you know trendy words that we use, it it can’t be only on them. Because it’s- that’s not gonna work. (G I, 86.39)

Some of the IUG participants noted that they made friends during their orientation, so having international students join the orientation programs with all students might provide a good opportunity for them to meet more people—both international and HCN students, particularly if the university structures activities that promote—or even require—mixing across cultural groups.

This staff member also expresses concern with the ability of HE institutions to conceptualize IHE and to plan and implement internationalization strategies. She believes that while universities may express a desire to internationalize, they might not know how to go about doing so. She fears that the university communities themselves may not have a clear idea of what internationalization might mean for their institutions, or what some IHE initiatives—such as increasing international student enrollment—might actually entail.

I feel like it’s a goal that universities want. They don’t know how to do it and they don’t realize that, it’s going to come with, you know it’s going to cost money in some ways, it’s going to come with all these consequences that they don’t fully understand. They think by internationalizing that it just means, ‘we’re gonna get more students, and we’re all gonna be culturally aware,’ and they don’t realize that, there needs to be a structure in place for having these discussions. (G II, 97.34)

She also characterizes IHE as something that has wide appeal as it seems to align well with espoused values in the USA, such as diversity. But a note of cynicism can be

detected in her view that HE institutions need to engage in careful planning for internationalization in order to move beyond mere structural change, and that they bear a responsibility to support the students they admit.

I feel like it's just sort of like, the value you know America places on diversity in the workplace. Or diversity in a school.... It's something that Americans would say is an American value, diversity or everyone's equal. But we don't want to work very hard to make it happen. And so, we we still self-segregate, you know and we- and so I think like universities take that on. Yes it looks great in grants, it looks great on reports. 'Look at the number of international students we have and the number of black students we have and the- ' but, it's- to make it really happen, to make it something that's valuable and, full of you know-, something that's useful and becomes a part of the culture at the University, we have to put something more into it than just, 'yeah you can come here. And you pay this much money,' and that's it. (G II, 97.34)

Staff Participant J spent quite a bit of time engaging with the concept of IHE and what it might mean. She first noted that it has meant a lot of things to a lot of people over the years and listed several of the things that have been mentioned in the literature, including student and faculty mobility, internationalization of curricula, and international research. But then she expressed doubt over whether those actions necessarily lead to the development of what she calls a global mindset. People who participate in overseas study—international students coming to the USA or domestic students leaving the USA—may or may not experience a broadening of their views, she said. She also noted that it is unreasonable to expect all faculty to add international dimensions to their research or teaching and offered an illustrative analogy:

Adding in international aspects to ah teaching when it's something that you don't have as your own global mindset, is, not helpful. I mean it's this, like if someone asked me to put in in my teaching some aspect, that I- that isn't my focus area. Like maybe linguistics. ... I could try and figure out a couple of articles and talk about linguistics, you know, and sort of touch on it and say, 'and here is our module in linguistics.' But is that really linguistics in- you know, adding a linguistics element into the class? Not really. (85.51)

Her next move was to conceive of IHE in terms of outcome, which she posited to be a global mindset. But she remarked on the unlikelihood of that being a universal outcome, too: “So what does internationalization really mean? And is it achievable? It probably means having everybody develop a global mindset. And is that achievable? Probably not” (85.51). She seemed to toy with the idea of IHE being a potentiality or the provision of opportunities for learning and developing a global mindset:

And so you can't really force it on anybody, and you can't set it up by necessarily,- does it mean by having more international students we become more internationalized? Mmmm. You know it's it's, I suppose at least it provides an opportunity for that to happen and if you don't at least do that, then there's even less of an opportunity. (85.58)

Her opinion that IHE cannot be forced on anyone stands in contrast to the previous participant's support for forced integration and view that “everybody has to be on board” (G I, 86.39). Participant J's view, in contrast, seems to be that an institution can provide opportunities that may be taken up by some people, but that anything a HE institution could do would not be sufficient to achieve complete internationalization in the form of a global mindset for everyone on campus. The approach she takes in her own classes is to structure assignments that encourage students to engage in new intercultural experiences locally, or to see the interconnectedness of the world reflected in everyday objects. Her hope is that through what she calls “everyday international” (85.60) activities, the students will start (or continue) to develop an awareness that may lead to a global mindset.

Another UU staff member characterized himself as a “trench warrior” (B 89.39), so focused on pragmatic matters related to his administrative duties that he had little energy left to focus on abstract matters outside his own research. He did, however, have a

clear worldview and strong opinions regarding the importance of intercultural learning, which he expressed as being second nature to him.

I can't think of anything other than the world as a whole whether you want to call it international or global, as, the relevant domain for doing things. ... I mean it's just so embedded in me, yes! Of course! I mean, who- how how could we have been at a place where we weren't thinking about these things? I've been thinking about it since I was a kid! What do they do over there (laughs), you know? Let's go see! So, you know that's my concept. Sh- you know, I don't have a, real formulated, plan on it. We should be doing as much as possible. And, we should be putting resources into it. (89.41)

He highlights factors that impact student mobility and clearly views the admission of international students as a positive factor in internationalization:

The US has a lot more capacity in higher education than many other countries do. And as a result of that there's gonna be greater motivation—even you know forcing of, you know export of students from particular countries. So that is a real factor. But, given all that I think it's a good thing. It mixes up the world and it makes it a smaller place. So what is the role? I think in both directions it's incredibly important. Like if you just take a U.S. centric perspective, what what good is it for the University of Utah? Well I think we ought to be having students coming and visiting for a short time, other students coming and from other places. ... The whole world. Any place where they want to send people I think we could benefit from having them. (89.42)

After a little prompting, he lists several of the potential benefits that an internationally diverse student body might bring to U.S. universities. For one thing, a little intercultural exchange by way of interacting with a diverse body of students on campus may prompt some local students to travel outside the USA to continue their intercultural learning:

I think it provides, the people who are here an opportunity to have different perspectives, different styles of living, different styles of perceiving. Bringing more ideas to the table, it's good. I mean there aren't more atomic elements over there than there are here, so that's not gonna have as much of an effect but I think other you know ways of, interacting, recognizing different, perspectives on an exchange- in a discussion on class—whatever the class is—is important because, you know the world is smaller. So whatever you're gonna do out there, I think you're you're gonna end up being a better person if you've encountered more types of things during your educational perspective. You have more types of relations with people in your classroom so you're more ready to have that in the

rest of your existence. But not just coming in. I think also, as a global university, those people who grew up down the street here ... coming here and then seeing it as a launch pad for say a summer away. (89.45)

Clearly, this UU staff member's conceptualization of IHE is founded on student mobility. He views student mobility—realized as both international students coming to the USA and American students participating in study abroad programs—as opportunities to facilitate the exchange of different views which, in turn, can lead to intercultural learning that will better equip students to function successfully in a globalized society.

Globalization and internationalization. In interviews with two UU staff members who work in international education, I explicitly asked for conceptualizations and comparisons of the terms *globalization* and *internationalization* in the context of higher education. Not surprisingly given their work, they both had well articulated views on IHE and made clear distinctions between the two terms. Their descriptions included both abstract conceptualizations of the terms as well as more concrete strategies or goals for internationalization at UU.

The first participant distinguished between *globalization* and *internationalization* by associating the former with economic and financial concerns: “that definitely applies to how universities think about themselves and revenue streams and, you know both costs of dealing with different student populations but also the revenue and the benefits that they bring” (E II, 88.1). Her preferred term is *internationalization* because she views it as more strongly associated with her area of interest, which is curricula and students. This view is very much rooted in intercultural learning:

My focus or my interest is both internationalization, in the sense of how, internationalized our curricula are, in the sense that they allow students to gain perspectives on important issues that are not just US-based. And you know perspectives from around the world on important global issues—I mean truly

other perspectives not just Americans saying, ‘I know what Africans or Europeans say.’ But you know what are the Europeans or Africans actually saying about certain global issues. (88.1)

For her, internationalization of the curriculum concerns courses and majors, interaction among students from different cultures, and study abroad opportunities, and it requires a “critical mass” of faculty with an international focus.

The second participant also sees curricula as an important part of internationalization, but she describes it in terms of “a response to, the needs, at large, out there” (A II, 28.1). In her view, globalization is the external force that drives IHE.

Though she notes that both terms can have negative connotations, she prefers to use internationalization to describe the ways HE institutions position themselves and operate in global contexts. This view, she points out, marks a shift from Knight’s (2008) view of IHE as a process or something that is integrated into everything that universities do. The focus now has shifted:

Looking more externally outside of the university, what are the forces outside of the universities, yeah the world getting smaller, and, in terms of you know the kinds of development work that we could be engaged in whatever the needs of sort of society at large, that shape higher education and make it global, by nature. (28.1)

She further characterizes this shift in conceptualizing IHE from something that occurs within an HE institution—incorporating a global dimension into teaching, learning, and research—to something that involves the institution in the global context:

Now we’re looking at it, almost the opposite way. You know what, what is, what are the needs of the world at large that higher ed needs to respond to? And so we’re we’re, we’re becoming more global but not because, we’re saying we need to be more global, it’s because the world is making us be more global. (28.1)

The negative connotations of *internationalization* she mentions echo some of the concerns brought up by other participants. She says that it can be viewed as

kind of an imperialist, thing that we do. Um, because when we talk about internationalization in the developed world, we're often not including the less developed world. Or it's something that we impose on them or it's something that, we're putting more stress, on their systems cause we're sending all these students to study abroad there but, they're not necessarily, benefiting from, from that. (28.1)

But she holds a positive view of this shift in focus in IHE and even calls her own view idealistic. "Seeing ourselves in this global context will, improve the kinds of research that we do and the kinds of learning that our students, um, are engaged in because it's, highly relevant, for, you know, the world at large" (28.1). In practical terms, she says this shift might involve a greater focus on international internships than on more traditional study abroad programs and a wider selection of destinations outside Western Europe.

Internationalization at UU

From Internationalization to Global Engagement

As I described in Chapter I, one of the things that shaped my focus for this research was the final report written by the Presidential Task Force on the Internationalization of the University (May 2006). Shortly after I began this research I came across another document from January 2013 called The President's Global Strategy Blueprint. I was immediately stuck by the shift in terminology from *internationalization* to *global strategy*. In an interview with one of the people who worked on the 2013 document, I asked about that terminology change:

UU Staff D: I can't say that it has any real content to it other than that suggested the terminology that's more commonly in use around the world these days. Everybody talks about globalization and. To the extent there is any content to it, it simply has to do with the (*sighs*), well the optimistic take on it would be that it's looking at the world as a single global enterprise. As opposed to a collection of nation states. International implies individual sovereignty and all of that. Globalization implies a little more commonality. Now do people realize that they have (*laughs*) made that- a conscious decision I don't know. (UU Staff D, 95.4)

[...]

Kris: it seemed that in the that first report, [...] there was a lot of focus on things that we could do on campus to increase the, maybe intercultural awareness and competency of everybody on campus. And it seemed like some of that was missing from the latter document and that it was more, ‘what can the University do in the world.’ More outreach.

UU Staff D: Um, I think that’s right. That was (*sighs*) [*author’s name*]’s focus. I I would put it this way. In 2006, the global economy was booming, US universities were still highly in demand for higher education. By 2012, there simply wasn’t the money to send students here from anywhere except China. China was still a source, but it was also clear to my mind that US higher education was no longer the predominant commodity that it had been for 50 years following World War II. The rest of the world had caught up in terms of higher education and so we were not gonna be as heavily in demand. [...] So it seems to me – and I didn’t have much influence on that, on the written product other than just small casual (laughs) talk of this type – that the emphasis really was not gonna be on bringing foreign students here nearly as much as it was gonna be on our getting out and engaging with other countries. (95.9)

Another staff member shared her perception that the 2012 document was written by different people for a different purpose and audience. She also commented on the strategic use of language:

I think it’s the same thing sort of to appeal more to stakeholders constituents outside the University. Internationalization is very much associated I think with academic domain, and globalization is something that maybe resonates more with people in the business community and government. (That is/they’re?) sort of thinking about the effects on the economy, and you know very parallel to that all the immersion education—language—it’s very much focused on that. And it’s in in a way it’s just- it’s in itself a strategy, right? And *the strategy is that you you use the language to sort of um get people invested and and see the connection between language education, internationalization, and the benefits economically.* (emphasis added, 31.9)

Participant Views of IHE at UU

After asking participants about their conceptualizations of IHE, I asked them how they thought UU compared to their conceptualizations, what they thought UU was doing to internationalize, and what it might do differently. The participants expressed varied

levels of knowledge of and enthusiasm for UU's efforts at internationalization and global engagement. What emerged was a picture of a somewhat fragmented set of programs, activities, and initiatives with many UU staff participants mentioning things that were happening in their own departments but few of them able to name a cohesive articulated internationalization plan or strategy for their program, department, or college. It was only those participants whose work was directly connected to international education who were able to articulate a strategy.

The students expressed mixed views on internationalization at UU. Amber said that she had noticed more international students at UU from more countries. Because international diversity in the student body was one of the key components of her concept of IHE, she considered this increase in IUG enrollment to be an indication that UU was doing a good job of internationalizing. She also stated that, overall, faculty were respectful of students from different countries and that it had gotten easier for her to make friends with students from different countries, though that may have been because she had been at UU for more than a year and had adapted to the culture and gained confidence in her ability to speak English.

Zhong, Donghyun, Jiyeong, and Xuefang had slightly different experiences than Amber with respect to interaction with students from different countries. They all indicated that they spent most of their time with classmates who shared an L1 and a similar cultural background. They had very little interaction with students from different countries, they said, and what little they did have tended to be with students from the same geographical region (i.e., students from other East Asian countries). Their opinions were split on how intercultural interaction at UU could be promoted—or even whether it

should be promoted.

Kris: Do you think there's something that the University can do to help maybe break some of those cultural barriers or help to get people to mix together more? Do you think there is anything or do you think they should do anything?

Zhong: I don't think they should do it. And I think it's not very easy to do it if you- they want.

Zhong said breaking a cultural or language barrier was not "one day work" and that some things, like humor, were very different and very hard to adjust to or to change. "I think it's not easy way to change it. Yeah, just leave it" (12.18). Xuefang expressed a similar idea, in spite of the fact that she has found it difficult to make American friends: "I think university cannot push people communicated together. Just themselves want to do it, it will be better" (11.21). She said that if American and international students wanted to learn about intercultural communication and meet people from other cultures, they could take a class.

The views these students expressed that intercultural interactions could not be forced were very different from the UU staff participant who said she used "forced group work" to get her students to interact with one another. Amber came the closest to agreeing with this view, though she was of the opinion that the students need to force themselves to interact with others.

Like the student views, the UU staff views were also mixed. One staff participant noted that there are opportunities every day in classrooms all across the campus to promote interaction and intercultural learning, but there seemed to be more opportunities missed than opportunities taken.

Unless you have some strategies and some knowledge and some training, you might not use your classroom as that occasion for the interaction and facilitating it.

But you know, we have lots of opportunities to create these kinds of interactions but I don't know how much of that we do. So, yeah. I I know you can't force it. But I I think we don't even facilitate it. (88.25)

Another staff member offered a critique that echoed the statement of the staff member who noted the negative connotation to *internationalization*: “to me it sometimes feels like, um, you know it's not global citizenship it's, it's kind of imperial global citizenship, (*laughing*) right? That's the way we do it. It's an imperialism. It's not really internationalization it's ‘imperialization’” (94.1). This participant also questioned the level of institutional commitment to comprehensive internationalization:

So to me it really is, if we were really serious about it, we would want people, we would want all students to take a language. We would encour- you know obviously financially not everybody can travel, but going somewhere. But you know even there there's this problem now that it used to be that, you were supposed to spend like a semester, and now they're saying six weeks right? And all the studies are showing that there is no way that your language improves in six weeks. Not very much at any rate. I mean, you know it's really minimal. So how do you do that? So I mean on the one hand I'm sort of glad that there's this concern about kind of the larger scope of things, but I don't see, the University really doing something that is increasing that. (94.33)

Several other participants—including students and staff—agreed that language study was a key component of IHE and of developing intercultural or global competence, and one staff member talked about the Culture and Language Across the Curriculum (CLAC) Program that was being piloted at the time. The CLAC Program provided students the opportunity to register for a “trailer” course taught in a LOTE that is attached to a lecture taught in English. The program has since expanded by adding classes and languages.

Language learning was only one of the ways for promoting intercultural learning that the participants mentioned. Interestingly, while many of the student participants, and at least one staff participant, called for more activities to promote internationalization,

other staff members listed several activities and programs that had been offered to help raise global awareness on campus. “We’ve just been trying to do a lot, of those kinds of things to really, you know either connect international students more or just to, bring them more in, in interaction with, with other students. And then another focus we’ve had is intercultural training, around campus too” (28.9). This staff member went on to name the peer mentoring programs offered through International Student and Scholar Services as well as several events sponsored by that office. She also talked about intercultural training workshops that had been offered to faculty, staff, and academic leaders. None of the other staff participants mentioned those workshops, so it is not clear whether they had been aware of them.

Opinions on what kind of faculty development could or should be offered also varied. As already noted above, one UU staff said she thought that internationalization should not be mandatory for faculty. Those who are interested in international research, curricular internationalization, or other opportunities will take advantage of them and those who are not interested should not be forced to do so. As another UU staff participant stated, though, there should be a critical mass of faculty members in every college, department, and program who are in some way engaged in international or global matters and have some measure of intercultural competence, but it still needs to be up to individual faculty members to decide what their level of involvement will be.

A third staff participant argued that internationalization needed to be incentivized for faculty, perhaps with grants for curriculum revision. The revision process could start with key faculty members who had interest and experience in international or intercultural matters and then spread to other faculty over time, allowing for the critical

mass to be achieved. Alternatively, she thought funding could be provided for faculty to travel to sites where UU already has study abroad programs where they could engage in research. Teaching at the UU Asia Campus would be another way to gain international and intercultural experience.

Finally, there was a strong interest among some of the staff participants in internationalizing curricula at UU in order to promote the development of global competence among students. “I would think the overall goal or one of the goals of an internationalization, plan, or strategy would be you know to create globally competent students at this University and [international and domestic students interacting], you know, would be part of that” (27.1). Although she admitted that global competence had yet to be operationalized, one of her goals was for each college—and ideally each major—to have global learning outcomes. The global learning outcomes could be created with the model being used for general education outcomes. She also wanted to develop learning outcomes for the study abroad programs that UU administers.

Every major in this university, we would have, global learning outcomes, you know that we’re trying to achieve. And then that would really, guide us towards what we need to offer in the curriculum you know for each major that, allows us to you know then graduate students who are globally competent. And then assess that, as well. But that’s that’s definitely a goal, also through study abroad, we really need to set goals for study abroad and/or outcomes for study abroad, so you know every faculty-led program, and, you know other programs that that we manage that, you know, we have a certain set of criteria and know what we expect students to gain from that. (28.13)

This shift that Staff Participant A mentioned (in the previous section) in the way IHE is being conceived of may represent an expansion rather than a replacement of the old view of IHE as a process internal to the institution—at least in her own view of IHE. There are indications that the new global engagement view does not necessarily preclude

a concomitant emphasis on internationalizing the campus.

CHAPTER V

DISCOURSES OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND LANGUAGE/ CULTURE IN THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

To answer Research Question 3, I engage in an analysis of the discourses of the internationalization of higher education (IHE) and international students, noting the subject positions that are made available to, taken up by, or resisted by international undergraduates (IUGs). To begin this analysis I look at some of the self-identities expressed in interviews with IUGs. Next, I examine the lexical labels used in documents and in interviews—with a reflexive examination of my own use of labels—to represent/constitute/construct IUGs. Then, I turn to an analysis of the discourses of language, culture, and intercultural learning and communication that are embedded in discourses of IHE, which necessarily should include representations and subjectivities of IUGs and the opportunities they create for language use, in particularly translanguaging.

As a researcher I need to be careful with the way I frame the analysis and discussion of lexical labels and discourses. It is important for me to remember that language, like discourse in general, is constitutive and can have an effect on people and subjects. For these reasons I need to try to be aware and mindful of the language I use. As St. Pierre and Pillow (2000) state, we are constrained by our “mother tongue” of humanism, which makes it difficult to avoid binaries, oppositions, and categories.

Categorization and Lexical Labeling

Higher education institutions categorize people into different groups for different purposes. Broad divisions at UU, like many other U.S. HE institutions, include faculty, administrators, staff, and students, and each group can be further subdivided. Students are often classified as matriculated or nonmatriculated or undergraduate or graduate. These are binary distinctions that are more or less unproblematic. A distinction that I believe to be far more problematic is domestic versus international students. This distinction serves a purpose in terms of immigration and the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) tracking, as well as the reporting of international student mobility. But the carryover of those terms from the bureaucratic to the academic fields of discourse may mask some important differences or construct others.

As I will show in my analysis, international students are often conceptualized monolithically as second language (L2) English users. In fact, there is often an identity relation expressed between the two groups such that all international students are constructed as L2 English users and all L2 English users are constructed as international students. Of course this identity relationship does not hold up in actuality. There are international students who are L1 English users, and there are L2 English users who are classified as domestic students. Even among my student participants, who are all L2 English users, there are three permanent residents of the USA and one U.S. citizen. But the ubiquity of the term *international student* with a common construction of international student as L2 English users across so many discursive fields has led to some students who are officially domestic students taking on the subject position of international student. They also express varying senses of belonging to the UU

community.

International Student Self-Identities: Insider, Outsider, Language Learner, International

Kamon is a dual citizen of the USA and Thailand and was admitted to UU as a domestic student. As noted in Chapter IV, he wasn't sure whether he should follow the admission requirements for domestic or international students regarding required exam scores, so he submitted score for both the SAT and the TOEFL. It seems that UU also may not have known how to categorize Kamon as he, unlike other students at his UU freshman orientation, was not give a writing placement in his orientation packet nor grouped with international students who were told about the ESL writing placement exam. He did end up taking that exam, but only because he asked about his placement when he saw that there was no information about it in his papers. When I asked Kamon about his self-identity, he described it as situational. Whether he identifies as a local, as Thai, or as an international student depends the context and his disposition.

Kris: So how do you sort of, identify yourself? Like if you meet somebody here now and they ask you,

Kamon: Yeah, that's why it's kinda interesting, right?

Kris: Yeah it is interesting.

Kamon: 'cause like, ah well I say that I'm (*both laugh*) from Thailand, I would say, then? Cause the thing is that a lot of Thai- well I live- I legally reside in Utah you know so I was like, well I'm from Salt Lake. I go to the U, but originally I'm from Thailand, if they really wanna hear that, just you know. So, yeah that's- it's- I think it's just up to the situations. It just depend on my mood (*laughing*) I would say. You know like, what do you wanna talk about today you know.

Kris: So do you feel that- how how do you feel about yourself then? Is it kind of,

Kamon: Actually well the thing is that I've been here only two years, right. So, I

wasn't- I'm not like other kids here who- where they like, you know, grew up here. They went to school here. So I wouldn't say to like a, like American friends that I'm from here, because like they'd be, 'oh, which high school did you go to?' those kinds of [inaudible]. It's like well I'm actually from Thailand and you know I spent like let's say I spend 15 years in Thailand, 3 years in New Zealand, and 2 years in America. I would say I'm from Thailand. So, yeah that's what I would say. But like let's say I go skiing and I like met someone. And they say, 'are you from around here?' 'Yeah,' I would say, 'I'm from Salt Lake.' You know, that would be different. So but I would identify myself as like, practically international student?

Kris: Yeah. Yeah. I find that really interesting because, um, I mentioned to you I think in the email, one thing I'm interested in is when we think about international students, you know I think we have these two categories, [Kamon: Yeah] domestic and international.

Kamon: And how do you categorize them? [...] That's, yeah if you're gonna categorize me technically I'm a domestic student. [Kris: right] I got you know admit to this university through like a admission department as a domestic student, so. (3.10-11; 3.42)

Kamon noted that he is not anomalous in having been born in the USA, grown up outside the USA, and returned as a UU student. He has two friends who were born in the USA but, like him, raised in their parents' home country before coming back to the USA to attend UU. One of these students was raised in India and the other in Taiwan. He was not able to comment on their self-identifications, but they serve as reminders of the inadequacy of the labels *international* and *domestic student*.

Like Kamon, Jiyeong also self-identifies as an international student. Unlike Kamon, she is not a U.S. citizen, but she is a permanent resident and has been living in the USA since 1996. She attributes her self-identity as an international student to her "language level," meaning her view of her proficiency in English. It is not clear what external factors may have contributed to her positioning herself in this manner, but it is interesting to see the way she positions herself vis-à-vis other students. In one instance she apparently related English language ability to race as she commented, "even though

the Caucasian who cannot speak English well, I just think that they can speak English well” (15.7). She said she feels that other students think she cannot contribute as much during group work as they can because she is an L2 English user. She referred to this as a form of prejudice. As a result, she feels more comfortable working with “international students.” International students always want to work with her because her English is comparatively better than theirs—yet, not good enough, she seems to think, to leave behind her self-identity as an international student.

Some of the students compared themselves favorably to their domestic counterparts in some respects and unfavorably in others. Pam and Nancy expressed the idea that they were on an equal footing with American students in their science classes because they had a similar level of background knowledge in the sciences: “we are like almost at same like, same starting line. Because we we all [inaudible] like Americans and international students have like same like basic idea about the science” (Nancy, 34.15). But she stressed that was not the case in some areas of the humanities, where some international students may lack exposure to bodies of knowledge. Pam held a slightly different view in that she felt that her background knowledge in science helped make up for any gaps in English vocabulary. She also felt that her close study of English grammar helped her with the grammar-focused approach in her Spanish class. She had initially assumed that her American classmates had a higher listening comprehension level than she did but later realized that may not be the case.

Other students spoke about their status as insiders and outsiders, which shifted over time and according to context. Amber talks about feeling a bit like an outsider at first when everything was new and the language and culture were impenetrable.

It was so hard for me at first. And it was like I couldn't I couldn't understand what people are talking about, and especially in class the professors they are talking about jokes, I don't get it. And (laughing) and it was embarrassing cause everyone was laughing it was like, 'wow, w- what's so funny?' (Amber I, 26.7).

It probably did not help that her friends back in China had told her how much fun she was going to have in the USA: "You will be free and you will be so happy, you you will have a good time in America!" In retrospect, she figures they were thinking about the lifestyle of the Chinese students who come here just to receive a degree but not really to learn. They have jobs waiting for them back home in their parents' companies, and they have money to spend in the USA. But Amber constructs a very different academic identity for herself as a hard-working student, in opposition to the way her friends had positioned her: "That's not that's not what I'm thinking because, ah I'm here for studying so. It's totally different. And they were thinking maybe, 'wow you will have a good time in America, you can play every day.' No it's not (both laughing) I have to study every day!" (Amber I, 26.8).

Some of her hard work may be in an effort to measure up to her American classmates.

I'm in a group with a lot of Americans, I will feel a lot of pressure. So I have to do something, [...] if you just stay sit there and be quiet and they're talking about the topic it seems like you know nothing, you know (laughs). You have to know something. You're in the same class. They know it you have to know it too, so. So I have to talk about it. Give their my thoughts. Otherwise they will think, 'oh, you cannot do noth- they cannot do anything.' (Amber 2, 87.21)

This is an example of Amber struggling against her perceived positioning to construct a more favorable identity. It is interesting to note her shift from *you* to *they* as she voices what she perceives to be the attitude of the American students. It seems that she feels a responsibility to construct this positive identity not only for herself but also for other

international—or possibly Asian or Chinese—students. At other times, she seems to take pains to distinguish herself from other Chinese students and to position herself in a way that may not be expected of her as a Chinese student—namely, as an outgoing person.

Some Chinese student they don't they don't talk a lot to to foreigners. They just like keep quiet. Maybe that's because their personality, just- I am *I'm kind of outgoing* [emphasis added] so always, I like making friends. But, but, I I know a lot of people a lot of Chinese students here they they only make they only make friends in Chinese, so I don't- I'm not sure. But, one is like, maybe because the, personality. One is the, language differences. They do have hard time to communicate with others. So, and they, once they, they they don't practicing. And, they, they will find it harder so. They won't they won't try it. So I think that's the reason. (Amber 2, 87.18-19)

Amber names several possible reasons that many of her fellow Chinese students do not communicate much with non-Chinese students. Some may be naturally introverted, while others may be hampered by their (presumably English) language proficiency. These examples help her position herself as different from them as she notes her outgoing personality and, at other points during our interviews, her effort to use her language to interact with others both for the social aspects of communication and for the linguistic benefits. So we see Amber taking up a subject position as a student who takes initiative for her learning, works hard, and enjoys interacting with others.

In contrast to Amber, Pam describes herself as someone who does not like to speak out much in class in any language—in Chinese when she was in China or in English or Spanish in her classes at UU. “I’m kind of quiet girl normally” (Pam 2, 90.47). She prefers to speak in small groups. This aspect of her individual identity might be interpreted in different ways by other people—for example, in accordance with a subject position commonly constructed for “Asian” or Chinese students as shy or reticent or lacking confidence. Another position—which I will explore further below—is that some

international (Asian) students are not engaged in class, are passive, or lack creativity. But for Pam, being quiet does not mean that she wants to go unnoticed. She likes that her Spanish instructor learned her name on the first day of class. “I’m glad that he remembers me, my name. Yeah so. I think it’s quite, impressive for Asian to speak a Span- to learn Spanish or something, yeah” (Pam 2, 90.13). She also likes it when her classmates talk to her and take an interest in her culture. “I make friends [in the summer Spanish class] and they’re all nice to me and, they a kind of really, kind of kind of really interested in Asian culture or something. They will ask me questions about China or yeah. Things like that. And they’ll talk to me and that’s pretty nice” (Pam 2, 90.45).

The students expressed varying senses of belonging at UU, which sometimes differed from my expectations. Xuefang positions herself outside American culture and, hence, as somewhat of an outsider at UU. Even after being in the USA and at UU for 2 years she said she does not have American friends and, consequently, has not really experienced American culture (11.5). If, as Amber suggests, developing relationships from members of the local culture are key to learning about and participating in that culture, then Xuefang’s outsider status comes as little surprise. Her difficulty in deciding on a major may be contributing to her outsider position—choosing a major and belonging to a department may provide her with a group identity that will accord her an insider position at UU.

After hearing Amber talk about the importance of interacting with people at UU and her own self-identity as an outgoing person, I was surprised to learn that she still did not really feel like she was part of the UU campus community. She did say, however, that it had gotten easier to make friends after being here more than a year. The problem

seemed to stem from the fact that she did not spend much time on campus during her 1st year here. She is trying to get involved with more activities on campus in her 2nd year by joining clubs and finding both paid and volunteer work (Amber 2, 87.40-42). These activities may contribute positively to her sense of belonging in two important ways. First, her increased interaction with groups of students on campus will provide more opportunities for her to use language, potentially building both her competence and her confidence in her ability to use English, thereby making further interaction easier and more enjoyable. Second, the interaction may, as suggested for Xuefang, provide Amber with a group identity within UU, with other members of the UU community, allowing her access to the position of full member of that community.

It was a different story for Pam. The day that I shadowed her, Pam had mentioned to me that she was not used to talking to someone so much and that she had greatly enjoyed it. I wondered whether she felt isolated and what her sense of belonging was at UU. I asked her in the follow up interview whether she felt lonely, and she said she did not. She enjoyed her time alone as much as her time with friends. In addition, Pam strongly identifies as a UU student and part of the UU community. She takes pride in being a UU student.

This is the first place that I came to US. And I'm kind of feeling like it's my hometown in the US. And this is my home school in US. And sometimes like yeah we hear that, we heard that our football game team win- won, and I was like I I'm kind of glad too. And there's a kind of videos about our university, how good our university are. I'll share that link and say, 'this is my university.' I'll feel like kind of proud. And things like, yeah. So I think I feel part of our university, yeah. (Pam 2, 90.50)

This statement supported the impression I had formed from my interactions with her. She spoke of participating in activities and interactions with friends, and she

demonstrated knowledge about the campus and resourcefulness. When I asked whether there was any time that she had felt like she didn't belong here, she unequivocally stated that she felt she belonged here: "I don't know how to say that you're not feeling part- I mean, I don't feel like that way because it's my university. Yeah it's my first university of all time" (Pam 2, 90.50). This is in spite of the negative experience she had in her first-semester Spanish class (90.45). She has clearly taken up the subject position of UU student and rejects attempts to position her as an outsider.

Labeling IUGs³¹

The entextualization process that makes text into a coherent unit (Bauman & Briggs, 1990) also creates lexical labels that reduce discourses into single words or short phrases. As with other discursive strategies, these labels constitute subjects and assume taken-for-granted meanings that work to constrain creators and subjects of discourses. They sometimes appear in binaries, with one label in the pair accorded higher value or status than the other through processes of normalization. This hierarchical ordering contributes to other processes such as othering, erasure, and the construction of deficit discourses. With this understanding of the discursive power of labels, I analyzed the way lexical labels were used in interviews and documents to refer to international students at UU.

Several labels were used to categorize students or to refer to segments of the student population at UU. The stated purpose of my research as IHE with a focus on IUGs—and my own questions during interviews often asked participants about their experiences with or as IUGs—served to construct a discourse in which the salient

³¹ In this section due to the sensitive nature of the analyses and my participants' desire for anonymity, I am not using identifiers for interview quotations.

categories were international and noninternational students. It is not surprising, then, that the label *international student* was frequently used by interview participants. What is interesting is the way that label was used: the assumptions that seemed to be made about members of the category (and nonmembers), the labels used in oppositions that formed binaries, and alternative labels that were used to refer to the same category of students. An analysis of these labels is one step to understanding the discourses of international students circulating at UU and the subject positions that are created in these discourses.

I identified three main groupings³² in my analysis of the lexical labels frequently used by interview participants and in UU documents to refer to students: generic labels that refer or appear to refer to all students; labels based on the nationality of students; and labels based on the language that students speak. These labels are listed in Table 4. There are problematic uses of labels from all three of the categories, particularly with respect to their uses in binaries.

Two of the labels that, depending on the context, could be used to refer to all students at UU in a generic and inclusive way were also used in ways that exclude and other groups of students. In an interview, *our students* was used in opposition to *international students*: “We know that among all of the students there’re some [courses] that are better than others for particular kinds of students. *This is true (laughs) for our students as for the international students as well* [emphasis added].” Here, the international students are not included in the label *our students*. They are positioned as outsiders or as the Other in an Us and Them binary.

³² This is not an exhaustive list of the labels used to refer to students. I have not included here a few other infrequently occurring categories that fall outside the scope of this research: gender (e.g., specific mention of female students or women), race/ethnicity (e.g., specific mention of “native Indian students,” Asian American students, Black students, White students), majors or departments (e.g., specific mention of business students, humanities students), and student athletes.

Table 4
Lexical Labels Used to Refer to Students

Generic Labels	students undergraduates graduate students all students UU or U students ^a our students ^a
Labels Based on Nationality or Region	international students domestic students American students U.S. nationals Chinese students Asian students <i>infrequent mention of other specific nationalities</i>
Labels Based on Language	native speakers ^b native-speaking students native English speakers native speakers of other languages non-native speakers non-native English speakers ESL students ELLs language learners heritage speakers <i>infrequent mention of speakers of specific languages other than English</i>

^a The way these labels were used was not always inclusive of all UU students. See discussion on binaries and othering in the text.

^b More often than not used to refer to native speakers of English, but sometimes used to refer to native speakers of other languages.

Two similar cases occurred in UU documents. In a description of institutional-level changes designed to promote internationalization, several programs for students were listed. One was described as follows. “The Ambassador Program: allows U students to develop relationships with international students” (Task Force Progress Report, p. 8). Here again there are two labels used in a binary, with *international students* being excluded from the group labeled *U students*. This positioning runs counter to the action

step listed in the final report of the task force on internationalization to “increase international students at the U, and *enhance their integration into the campus community* [emphasis added]” (Task Force Final Report, pp. 12–13). It is noteworthy that this action step was not elaborated upon in the report. The authors stated their intention to describe more fully “only those [action steps] we feel need emphasis and elaboration” (p. 4). In the section on students (subtitled “expanding opportunities for international experiences” [p. 6]), the action steps selected for “emphasis and elaboration” are titled “Increase Students Studying Abroad,” “Increase International Students Coming to the U,” and “Expand Language Options for Students.” The section on international students begins with an explanation of the rationale, with the remainder of the section devoted to recruitment strategies. In the rationale for increasing international student enrollment is the second example of a binary that opposes *international students* to *our students*: “*An important way to bring international experiences to our students* [emphasis added], especially those who do not have an opportunity to study abroad, *is to expose them to international students on our campus* [emphasis added]” (p. 7). In all of these cases, then, international students are marginalized, a move that runs counter to the discourses of inclusion and integration that are present in the texts.

Many of the binaries (summarized in Table 5) that referred to the nationality of students may not appear to be problematic in the way of the three cases just discussed. Over half of them opposed *international students* to *domestic students*, *domestic counterparts*, *American students*, *U.S. nationals*, or *noninternational students*. However, even these apparently neutral or natural labels are constructions that have effects, at times stereotyping or at times essentializing students based on the broad categories they are

Table 5
Binary Oppositions of Lexical Labels Referring to Students

Overtly problematic binaries	
International students vs.	native speakers native-speaking students native English speakers our students U students
American students vs.	non-native speakers non-native speakers of English
Covertly problematic binaries	
International students vs.	domestic students/domestic counterparts American students U.S. nationals noninternational students
Native speakers vs.	non-native speakers ELLs ESL students

placed in and excluded from. One use of the *domestic student–international student* binary can be read at least in part as constructing international students as in need of remediation:

Domestic students have Ed Psych classes that they can take that, can help them learn some, like strategies for studying and and other things. So if you're a new student and you're not really sure what to do or or, or *if you get put on academic probation or something you have to take some of those classes. [ESL] classes are really similar to that, but they are geared toward, you know including some of the cultural things that are specific for international students* [emphasis added].

The comparison here is between classes for students who are on academic probation and ESL classes for international students. Stereotypes can be found in statements like the following:

Sometimes the faculty will say things to me like, 'well if I could get my- you know if I could just get the international students to read the book.' Well, the truth is, most—in my experience – most international students they do read. They read, they read more than any of their domestic counterparts. They read it read it read it, they read for hours, they do not understand (laughs) it.

Here a UU staff member reports a stereotype she has heard from faculty members—that international students do not complete assigned reading—and she counters it with a pair of her own stereotypes—that international students do in fact read (even more than domestic students), but their reading comprehension is low. These examples contribute to deficit discourses, which will be discussed more below.

These labels are not always used to compare international students unfavorably to domestic students or to marginalize them. A different kind of stereotype can be seen in the next example:

International students have a better idea of the big picture. Than, American students. Like American students—and maybe this is, this is, um, a byproduct of the ed- the public education? System? is that, they see everything in just terms of task one task two task three. They don't see, they don't look at the syllabus and see how all three tasks, are leading up to the other, for a product? And I think that international students, have, they they see the big picture, more.

This is a “positive” stereotype. Although it does not constitute international students as deficient, it does essentialize them.

In many cases, participants remarked on the lack of difference between the two groups, as this example illustrates:

My experience of business students is that they are [...] hard-core pragmatists, right? They are instrumentalists. They want to know, ‘what am I going to do with this knowledge?’ [...] And I think it is, I don't think that's necessarily different for domestic or international students.

Less frequently, a more complex view of international students and their relationship to the greater university community, as well as the role they may play in internationalization, was expressed, as in this statement: “You know international student support which also means integration and then contact with American students, and using- and and looking at what they bring to the University.” Statements like this one use the lexical label

international student to create a multidimensional subjectivity rather than the flattening that occurs in the essentializing or deficit discourses noted above.

Another quotation from an interview serves to illustrate the slipperiness of the labels *international student* and *domestic student*, as remarked upon at the beginning of this section. Speaking about the Fall 2014 enrollment at the UU Asia Campus (one of four international universities on the Incheon Global Campus in South Korea), one staff participant said, “I think we’re at 15, and I mean and three of them are Americans. So yeah. I think there are 12 international students.” I was struck by the fact that the American students studying at the South Korean campus were not labeled *international*, whereas the Korean nationals were. The label *international* in this case seems to be intentionally employed to underscore the fact that the UU Asia Campus is part of UU, in spite of the fact that it is located outside Utah and the USA. Admissions information on the UU Asia Campus website (<http://asiacampus.utah.edu/undergraduate-admissions/>)—which links to the UU online admissions application—parallels this usage. By way of comparison, the label *international students* is used on the Incheon Global Campus website (http://www.sgu.or.kr/sgu/new_eng/student/immigration.htm) to refer to students who need to apply for a D-2 student visa in Korea—that is, to non-Korean students.

Many of the lexical labels in the final category—labels that refer to students in terms of their status as native speakers, non-native speakers, or language learners—are on their own already contested labels. For example, the labels *native speaker* and *non-native speaker* have been problematized with respect to discourses of deficit and monolingualism (Cook, 1999; Holliday, 2005, 2006; Jenkins, 2009; Kabel, 2009; Kachru, 1989; Modiano, 2001), and I have already discussed limitations of the labels

international and *domestic students*. The way the labels in this category are used in binary oppositions construct students in ways that make assumptions about the English proficiency of all students and tend to disregard linguistic resources in languages other than English (LOTE). These overtly problematic binaries comprise nearly half of the uses of opposition in the data.

The binary opposition of *international student* with *native speaker*, *native-speaking student*, *native English speaker* and related terms is illustrated in the following quotations from the UU staff interviews:

- “Many of my colleagues have ... provided different guidelines for international students. Like allowing them to take- to write papers twice. Whereas native speaking students only write them once.”
- When a student, regardless of, you know native speaker or, international, that, that we use that as a teaching moment but when we’re teaching, that our international students may actually need, ‘take out a piece of paper, and write these words down and give them the piece of paper to take away with them.’
- “In this last- in this semester, I probably had, three, three native speaking students, English speaking students, come for help, and two international students.”
- “With the, the diversity class, what happens is the, students who are not native speakers of English learned one thing in the course, and the American students, learn something completely different.”
- But an American student could easily, turn in work that is not their own for an entire semester and I would never know.[...] It’s a different type of cheating, I think that goes on for them. And the non-native speakers, right, because their English isn’t quite as good, they have no idea how easy it is to see the difference (*laughs*).

Based on these and similar uses of these labels, it seems that there is an assumption that (at least at UU) all international students are non-native English speakers and that all domestic or American students are native English speakers, implying that no international students are native English speakers and no American or domestic students

are non-native English speakers. In other words, international students at UU are frequently constructed as non-native speakers of English, while domestic students are constructed as native speakers of English.

As noted above, there are students at UU for whom these assumptions are false. Four of my student participants are U.S. permanent residents or citizens (Jiyeong, Donghyun, Fenfang, and Kamon) who are L2 English users. In addition, though they did not participate in this study, I have known international students at UU who are L1 English users. For Kamon, the fact that he did not fit neatly into one of the two student categories (international or domestic), with the attendant assumptions regarding status as a native speaker of English, meant that he had no information regarding his writing placement at freshman orientation. He had to seek out information regarding writing placement and ultimately took the ESL Writing Placement Exam. Undergraduate applicants who identify as L1 English users but are not U.S. citizens (or have not been permanent residents for at least 5 years) need to demonstrate their English proficiency with a score report from a recognized examination; students from Australia, Canada (except Quebec), Ireland, New Zealand, and United Kingdom are exempt from this requirement (<http://admissions.utah.edu/apply/international/english-proficiency-waivers.php>). From an institutional perspective, these practices are likely to make sense for the sake of efficiency, as the numbers of exceptions to the recognized categories (e.g., Australian or U.S. citizens who are not proficient English speakers) may be small. Yet these practices do still sustain the discourses that construct native speakerness and otherness.

The binary oppositions such as *international student* versus *native speaker* or

American student versus *nonnative speaker* are problematic in another way. The already problematic label *non-/native speaker* becomes all the more troublesome when it is used as a stand-in for *non-/native speaker of English*: It erases the L1 of international students and constitutes them as people who lack a native language. This move, then, reinforces the deficit discourses of international students.

The way these lexical labels are used in binary oppositions helps construct and reinforce the subject positions made available to international—and other culturally and linguistically diverse—students in the discourses circulating at UU. Following a discussion of my own use of lexical labels during my interviews with students and staff, I turn to my analysis of the discourses evident in the texts that constitute my data.

Interrogating my own use of lexical labels. Looking self-reflexively at my own participation in discourse, I began to question my own use of lexical labels. How might I be positioning international students in my interactions with participants? What is the effect if I ask questions such as whether a department provides support for faculty to help them work with their *international* students when what I really mean is *culturally and linguistically diverse* students? If I am concerned with helping faculty learn to be more aware of difference/diversity and develop ways of working more effectively with diverse groups rather than expecting everyone to be the same, is that concern reflected in the language that I use?

The labels I used more than once in interviews, in descending order of frequency, are listed in Table 6. *Students* and *international students* were used far more frequently than the others—more than all the others combined. My use of the word *students* at times indexed a particular set of students that was clear from the context. At other times, I

Table 6
Researcher's Use of Lexical Labels for Students
(Descending order of frequency)

Students
International students
American students
Chinese students
International students vs. domestic students
International students vs. American students
Mixed students
Undergraduates
International undergraduates
Domestic students
Graduate students
Korean students
ESL students
University students
International graduate students

either used the word as a general collective (e.g., in opposition to faculty) or I used it intentionally ambiguously to allow my participants to choose which students to talk about or clarify which students they were talking about in response to my questions. My frequent use of the label *international student* is understandable given the context of my research, but it is not unproblematic, as discussed above.

I was somewhat surprised to see how frequently I used the label *American students* because I thought I had used *domestic students* more frequently. I think I may have consciously tried to use the latter as the preferred label in opposition to *international students* but not in isolation. I succeeded in doing so roughly two-thirds of the time, but the *international–American students* binary did creep into my speech on several occasions. I also sometimes used the label *mixed students* in opposition to other labels, as in as “you teach not only international students but you also have ah mixed groups like,

or domestic students and international students together,” and “when you’ve been in in, groups of mixed students, maybe Americans maybe Korean whatever, from other countries”; I used *mixed students* in isolation, as well. It is not surprising to see that I used *Chinese students* more frequently than other nationality-based labels (with the exception of *American students*) given that most of my IUG participants were Chinese, as are the largest number of IUGs at UU and in my staff participants’ classes.

What is perhaps most surprising to me is to see that I managed to use my “preferred” term—*culturally and linguistically diverse students*—only once. However, I did find other ways of being inclusive of students from different backgrounds, using the following set of phrasal labels more frequently than all but the top four labels listed in Table 6: *diverse group of students*, *students from other places*, *linguistically and culturally diverse students*, *mixed students*.

Discourses of Language, Culture, and Students in IHE

In the previous chapter, I presented my interpretations of my participants’ conceptualizations of IHE and their experiences in the culturally diverse community at UU. Here I examine discourses that were evident in shaping and being shaped by their perceptions and experiences as well as the subject positions that are constituted through the discourses. These discourses construct (notions of) international students, culture/cultural differences, and language learning and use.

Discourse of Difference

Although there were a few instances in which participants constructed international students as the same as domestic students in many ways, international

students were for the most part constructed as different from domestic students. As seen above, some of these differences are represented through languages. International students are positioned variously as non-native speakers, English learners, L2 English speakers, speakers of languages other than English, and multilinguals. These positionings accomplish several things: They erase the cultural and linguistic diversity among domestic students; they essentialize IUGs into one category; and they make language the defining difference, ignoring cultural and individual factors. International students have also been represented as being distinguishable by their physical appearance. As can be seen in the following interview excerpts, they are sometimes racialized as non-White or specifically as Asian.

A few participants spoke of IUGs as being easily identifiable by their appearance, while others suggested that IUGs were virtually invisible. Interestingly, race was sometimes invoked in both cases.

I can only imagine, that the impact of international students on others students is none. And the reason why is because they are such an unbelievable minority. That they're not even- I I can't even imagine that people see them. Because it's so white. And and, you know, same seeks out same, typically. (81.37)

In this case, the UU staff member expresses her opinion that anyone who is different from the White majority at UU is essentially invisible to them. One of the student participants seems to have experienced this feeling: "Sometimes I feel like I'm invisible or something (laughs). Yeah because no one really notice you or something" (Pam II, 90.52).

At other times, staff participants spoke of international students as standing out or even being unable to hide. "When I do walk around campus, I'm just amazed, I'm like, international students are everywhere! You know because you can't walk, for more than I

would say, 300 feet before you're hearing- I mean, and that's even a long way" (30.26). In this example, it seems to be linguistic differences that the speaker hears that allow her to categorize students as *international*. In the next example, it is some undefined aspect of their physical appearance: "An international student can't hide what they look like to go talk to a professor, right? To try to come across as something different" (84.109). This discourse of difference constructs domestic students as much as it does international students. Domestic students are constructed as White or non-Asian and proficient English speakers—their diversity is erased. Anyone not matching that description may be identified as an international student. "I have some ESL class that I'm teaching, and I see a stray like Asian student and I'm like, 'are you here for ESL?' And then in perfect American English, I feel like—you know like he's like, 'no I'm not'—and then I feel like a big fat jerk," (81.44).

It is not only UU staff who seem at times to express the view that an Asian appearance is the marker of an international student. After my first interview with Dan, I suspected that he may have been constructing *international students* as Asian, so I asked him about it.

Kris: how do you know like who's an international student and who's not?

Dan: cause there's no Asian face (*laughs*).

Kris: okay so when you think international you think Asian?

Dan: yeah I just, uh- oh! No no no! (*Kris laughs*.) Oh actually

Kris: that's your first idea right?

Dan: yeah! Yeah. Sometimes I I thought- yeah. Like you said (*laughs*). International is Asian (*laughs*). But actually it's not! Oh I remember, our class can still have some some international students from Europe they're from Brazil, yeah. (*Laughs*.) But I thought that they were all Americans.

Kris: yeah right. Because they were not Asian, right? Yeah.

Dan: Ah yeah! (96.22)

Pam's first instinct also seemed to be to identify *international students* with Asian faces when I asked her whether she knew if there were many international students in her classes:

I don't really know because, (sighs) those are—except for Spanish class—those three classes are really large class so I don't really know those people or see those faces are Asian faces or not. So, I don't really know if there're, international students or not, but. I don't think there are many I mean, the domestic students are the ma- majority in the class so. (92.22)

In her case, though, she realizes that she cannot identify the international students among her classmates simply by looking at them. In most of her classes, she has little or no opportunity to interact with other students so she does not know where they are from.

These representations, together with others, come together in competing discourses. In the next sections I describe competing discourses I identified in the data and the discursive strategies used to constitute international students. The first discursive strategy is the construction of international undergraduate students as a burden to UU through negative representations of IUGs, processes such as erasure and essentialization that portray IUGs as deficient, and normalization of a limited set of behaviors defining “the good student” in opposition to IUGs in general or specific IUGs or groups of IUGs. Another discursive strategy is the absence of individual responsibility for working towards cultural synergy. The final discursive strategy I discuss is the construction of IUGs as a resource to UU.

Constituting the Burden: Negative Representations of International Undergraduates

One of the ways that IUGs are constituted in discourse is as a burden. They are positioned through deficit perspectives as lacking linguistic proficiency and being in need of academic and linguistic support, thus constituting a burden to the institution, the faculty, and even sometimes their classmates. They are also represented at times as less capable than other students, unengaged and unwilling or unable to participate, lazy, a threat to the integrity of the curriculum, and as manipulators or cheaters.

In this discursive strategy, references are made to the burden that international students place on resources in terms of the time and effort that would be required to make changes to better meet students' needs.

- So international students require a lot more time. And time that some [faculty] are not willing to give. So, and tha- this is a this is a generalization. This is not to say everybody I've talked to feels that way. But they are, they are frustrated. Faculty are frustrated with international students in the classroom. (81.34)
- There's a lot of perception issues for faculty, too. What do they perceive in the international students? I have people say, 'oh I don't- you know don't give me any [... ESL] students.' You know, meaning that, 'I don't want- that's too much of a burden for me.' Other people are fine to work with them but then feel like there are a lot of challenges, and and feel like the challenges are all the students' fault. (84.95)
- "So professors [feel] 'I've been teaching forever, and it's worked. Why should I change something,' you know. It's- it- this feeling is, 'now I have to change because of them'" (84.102).

The burden is also expressed in financial terms. "We have a lot of international students but, we don't like it when they come and we have to, we don't like having to pay you guys to give them English classes" (86.17).

'I can't keep running this kind of a program, if I don't receive some sort of outside help.' Right? He's not gonna take away from [...] graduate students'

funding, or travel money, to find for, international students to get their writing requirement. That just doesn't make any sense if you're the [*name deleted*] department. (84.30)

In a reframing of the discourse, it becomes the institution that is not equipped to educate its diverse student body that is the burden. "I often say, 'is this my responsibility to educate the whole university on what international students need?' That's not really in my job description" (84.65).

In the following interview excerpt, international students are represented as a monolithic group of students who do not take responsibility for their own learning.

I find that a lot of my international students are also- they seem to be my most disinterested, my laziest students. [...] I would think that if you're a person who knew, 'this is harder for me because, I don't speak the language that this is being done in, and even if I do I'm not as good at it, I'm not as fast as proficient,' you'd think they'd all put in additional effort because of that. And I find it's quite the opposite. They're often my least engaged students. The students who do not come to see me in my office hours, the students who do not you know show up at the review session for the exam, who don't come every day to listen to the lecture, who don't ask questions when they don't understand, you know? And that shocks me. I know if I was- if I went abroad to study, in a language that wasn't my own, I would- I would just know going into that I was going to have to put in way more time than the native speakers of whatever language that was. And I would put in the time if I wanted to succeed. And I don't know what accounts for that either. And by the- and by the way that is not something that is unique to any particular, ethnicity, culture, national origin. That's just my international students generally I find are, they seem, I don't know yeah. (99.53-54)

Not only are the international students constructed as bad students, but at the same time, a set of behaviors is normalized as the way to perform the role of (good) university student.

There is no room for other ways of being a (good) student. Another excerpt takes up this idea that international students are not capable of performing as good students:

The main [...] complaint, [of] faculty is that international students cannot compete, in the classroom. With- so the expectation is that our international students are going to come here, that they're going to earn the exact same degree, according to the exact same standards as everyone else in the class—they cannot do that. (81.15)

This representation of the inferior other helps construct a subject position of the capable American student:

Analyzing, our, international student population most of these students are coming from, um, a politically repressed, um, ah environment where information is not freely accessible, and, and a cultural background where you know like we encourage our students, um, to engage in a system of inquiry, and challenge. A lot of these students are coming from you know this, the teacher's the sage on the stage, and, there is no challenge and there is, you know critical thinking, um, is, not, necessarily encouraged in terms of you know like thinking for yourself. [...] Our international students from, these backgrounds, they don't, they don't know how to use, just I mean if we're talking about, the tools which are the databases, or the library system, or whatever they don't know how to use that. (29.20-21)

By implication, American students are engaged, well-informed critical thinkers.

I've been at faculty meetings or, you know any faculty event, there's, when I talk about the work that I do, whether it's from, somebody from, art and architecture or it's someone from engineering or it's someone in humanities, they say, 'they don't have, the skills.' Not only I- the- like, they don't, they struggle with the linguistic stuff which they expect but then, they're, especially when it comes to, um, research expectations.[...] The students don't have the skills. That, they don't know what plagiarism is, they don't know how to cite, they don't know how to do research, [...] and this is one of the major complaints. And, faculty don't have the time, and they may be, somewhat insensitive, to that as well. (29.19)

Again we see the construction of *the good student* as someone who knows how to do library research and write from sources, and the construction of international students as lacking in knowledge and skills. In this framing, the deficits are salient while the knowledge, skills, and abilities the international students possess are erased.

In the following excerpts, international—and particularly Chinese—students are constructed as reticent, shy, and less willing or able to participate or speak up in class.

- “Often the international students are very shy about talking to others so. You know and you don't want them to feel too uncomfortable either or that makes them not want to come to class” (94.49).
- My international students are generally very reticent to [get involved in discussions in class, respond to something another student has said]. I know

what it's like to be a person who doesn't speak the language in another country. It's daunting, and you feel embarrassed, and you're worried about how you're gonna sound. I think there are cultural norms here at work as well. I think that, Chinese students seem just less inclined to. (99.18)

- If I get a student who is an international student they are often much more shy. And that's that's across all cultural, boundaries I would say. But my Chinese students perhaps especially so. They're they're just- they're shy, they're very quiet. They're very uncomfortable, going out on a limb, you know. And making some kind of a- if I give them any pushback, to what they're saying, I find that they'll- I can often get long pregnant pauses of, you know, apparent worry. (99.19-20)
- My Chinese students are generally- I mean, I was about to say timid but that comes with a kind of a- that's a loaded word in a way. I don't mean necessarily timid. They are, reticent. Right? They're just generally,- they tend to not want to rock the boat. They're quiet. If I call on them they may or may not be totally prepared and and capable of interacting but they're just not gonna volunteer it. Generally speaking. That's not uniformly the case, but generally. (99.85)

At times this behavior is attributed to the difficulties the students may be experiencing as L2 English users. At other times the speaker speculates that cultural differences may also be at play, but he cannot seem to settle on this point as he also makes a few statements generalizing that “across all cultural boundaries” the international students are often “much more shy.” He also categorizes international students as “my most disinterested, my laziest students” (95.33). His construction of again *good student* seems to be contingent on the behaviors that are valued within the educational context that he is most familiar with. He names behaviors that are valued or even expected within the dominant culture in U.S. education—perhaps even more so in his particular discipline—and takes a sympathetic stance (Bennett, 1998) in his comparison of these students' behaviors with his expectations.

The result is a narrowly constructed culturally constrained view of how to be a good student. International students whose behaviors align with his expectations are not

only praised for being good students, they are viewed as students who care. This participant specifically referred to a small group of Russian students in his class who would speak out regularly and even challenge him at times, a behavior he clearly valued: “They care, man. They show up and they will engage. And that’s not because their English is necessarily good, but they care. And that’s cool, you know. So I mean I don’t know maybe that’s a cultural thing, too, I don’t know” (99.58). The implication, then, is that the students who do not engage in these culturally valued behaviors are identified as lazy students who do not care.

It is difficult to know whether many international students are aware of the subjectivity of a lazy, shy, or uninterested student that is being constructed for them. It may be the case that some are not aware, others are aware but find it difficult to change behaviors and values that were normalized in their home cultures, and still others may not care to change—or may actively resist change. One of the Chinese IUG participants asks for understanding from faculty of different ways that being a good student can be culturally constructed. She also calls for patience, noting that change in these behaviors takes time:

You know a, a lot of Chinese students they just like, ah, um, sit in the classroom and say nothing? Uh, I think part of the reason, first reason just like the language stuff, and the second one, they’ve used to it. Yeah. So I think the professor needs to understand this one. Yeah. Just uh, they’re listening to you but, maybe they’re not talking. [...] They’re just writing and listening. Yeah that that’s what we used to do. So it’s hard to change. (Amber III, 73.3)

She describes the cultural adaptation as being a two-way process, with international students expected to learn about and make an effort to adapt to the local academic culture and faculty recognizing the cultural differences for what they are so they can view the students from a culturally emic perspective. And yet she allows for

individual difference and agency—for example, the right of students not to participate in class:

I think [a professor] can like, encourage student to ah, to answer questions in class maybe, maybe he can talk to them, after class or send email, like to encourage them. Uh, once he tried if they, if they understand the professor maybe they can talk on class. And, if not, that's that just because of their own personality. So, you don't need to worry about that. So, uh, let them choose I guess. (Amber III, 73.4)

Different choices may come with different consequences, and it would still seemingly be up to the faculty then to decide what those consequences might be. Amber personally believes that including a grade for participation is a good way of “forcing” some international students to change their habits and also provide them more opportunities to use and improve their English. The educational culture that allows people to express opinions and values interaction appeals to her personally.

In addition to being positioned as shy, international students are represented as being self-segregating. “International students tend to hang together. They are not, in class you know they don't interact as much maybe mainly because maybe their comprehension and speaking skills are not as good” (81.28). Their language proficiency is named as a proxy that allows the blame for the lack of interaction between international and domestic students to be laid at the feet of the international students.

The international students offered a more complex picture of their choices to interact with compatriots or with students from other countries. Fenfang said some Chinese students have American friends while others do not. For some it is difficult to make American friends due to cultural differences, and others do not seem to want to make any American friends. Pam describes a range of experiences with other students in her Spanish classes. In the first semester, she felt like she was positioned as an outsider:

The first class Spanish class that I'm I was really not comfortable with other students. I don't know why. I just feel like I am the enemy with them (laughs). I don't know why it's just, I mean still racism there. I can feel it. So yeah. It's a kind of- I can feel like I, they, like- because always I'm the only Asian in the class. So they just look at me like in a really weird way. Or just like, sometimes I can feel they kind of stare at me or something like that. (90.45-46)

The following semester she made a lot of friends in her Spanish class and was still in touch with at least one American student at the time of the interview.

Jiyeong presents a different view of the issue of intercultural groupings for class activities and assignments. Like the staff participant quoted above, she said most students want to work with others from their same country (Jiyeong, 15.5), and she said she knows it is "racist," but the reason Asian students feel more comfortable with other Asians is they have a shared Confucian culture. She also expressed a reluctance to work with people she identified as Caucasian because they may remind her of someone who was once rude to her or who she perceived as rude. She gave an example of a "Caucasian" student abruptly saying, "WHAT?" after she spoke, like a rebuke. She said she does not need to worry about that happening when she talks to another Asian student. She went on to explain that it was always challenging for her to speak to "Caucasians"—even their appearance unsettles her. She experiences language anxiety and worries about students not understanding her or judging her. "Because they have better ability, they can judge me I say wrong or not" (Jiyeong, 15.7). She also expressed a preference for working with Korean students for ease of communication and bonding but said she has also worked with other Asian students.

Perhaps Jiyeong's reluctance to work with American students is a form of resistance to the way she perceives that she is positioned by them. She is thereby rejecting or resisting an identity of a less capable student. By working with other L2

English speakers whose English skills are not as high as hers, she can position herself as an expert rather than being positioned as a less capable group member—she can take up the identity of expert or proficient speaker or knowledgeable student.

Another way that international students are constructed as a burden is through representations of them as lacking integrity. What are described as frequent acts of manipulation and academic dishonesty cause frustration for faculty. “My international students often try to play that game with me, right, the the hope I never get noticed and I never have to speak up” (99.22). This participant also spoke of what might be possible failures on the part of international student recruiters to follow through on their promise that the students they recruit are well prepared for college and proficient in English, “or that it’s being gamed in some way by the students themselves” (99.35). He also stated that his “international students make all kinds of, what feel like annoying requests for special dispensations of all kinds” and gave an example of a student asking for a grade to be raised. The student said he had made a deal to do so with other professors because “it’s so much harder for international students” (99.42). “I definitely feel like there is this guilt trip that students try to give me, and my international students do it all the time” (99.50).

I also sometimes hear from international students who are not happy with their grade, they’ll come and meet with me to go over their exam and say, ‘well I didn’t know what that word meant.’ And they didn’t ask me! I I allow them to bring a dictionary. (99.29)

A few participants expressed their own belief—or reported what they perceived to be beliefs among other faculty members—that international students are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty. “What I hear from professors a lot is that they believe international students cheat all the time” (84.80). One participant communicated his

impression that business students seemed more likely to cheat than other students, and perhaps international students were more likely than other students.

I feel that anecdotally, and I don't know that I could necessarily back this up, that I've had more academic misconduct problems with international students. Of my international students with whom I've had those problems, the largest part of those have been students who are from China. The largest part of the students are from China. So I mean I can't tell you whether or not that's a function of where these international students are coming from or not. It may not be. But certainly I do have cheating concerns, problems, incidents every semester, with my international students. (99.28)

Another participant related an incident that took place on the UU Asia Campus:

Students [...] in this communications class they were supposed to take some pictures and then describe them. They were free to use pictures from any source, as long as they documented where it came from. And they were also free to take their own pictures to satisfy the requirements, again as long as they said, 'I took this picture.' And two students turned in the exact same picture, that was taken- one student said, 'this is my dog at home, and I took this picture.' And the other student said nothing. (84.81)

She characterized this incident as the first case of "big cheating" on that campus, yet she also problematized the construction of the act as cheating. "So I think, what's going on with this particular student? You know did they run out of time? Did they misunderstand the instructions? Did they- like there are so many different things that could be going on" (84.83). She also questioned the representation of international students as more dishonest than the domestic students. "Sometimes when faculty say things to me about their international students, I want to say, you just don't remember when that happened with your domestic students" (84.81). This move may be seen as production of a counter discourse.

One more move that contributed to the construction of international students as a burden was the representation of these students as a threat to the education of other students or to the curriculum. Faculty speak about not wanting or refusing to "handicap"

material (“is our job to teach the material the way we think it should be taught to regardless of who the student is or is our job to handicap the material for the students’ needs?”) or dumb down their courses for the benefit of IUGs in their classes.

Isn’t our charge as a state university to service first and foremost the students of Utah, who intend to be in the commerce, the world of commerce of Utah, right? To to pay the property taxes and the- you know and start the businesses and and create the jobs and yada yada yada, right? And all of that for for people here. And isn’t that, isn’t that mandate negatively affected by having larger class sizes, where we have to remedialize the material for students because they don’t have the English skills or the basic knowledge that would help them succeed, right? Every second I spend dumbing down the material, which I try not to do frankly, but every second anyone spends dumbing down the material is maybe a second that we’re not challenging the students who maybe are our primary responsibility. (99.90)

Here the threat is that the presence of international students may negatively affect American students by increasing the number of students in class and by requiring that material be “dumbed down” or “remedialized.” So in addition to being constructed as a threat, the international students are again constructed as deficient. The next excerpt displays a similar sentiment:

My exams [...] have a fair amount of text on them. [...] There’re long set up scenarios but they are multiple-choice, they’re not just dumbed down English. I don’t believe in dumbing down English, but I do think about the words, when I write it. Because I’ve even had native speaking students come up and say, ‘I don’t know what this word means.’ And so it’s like, okay. If there are two words that I can use, that will make it more straightforward for everybody, I’ll do that. And um, and so so I try not to change my exams, or my course structure. Specifically for an international population. (85.15)

Adapting material to meet the needs of international students is negatively compared to doing the same for “native-speaking students.”

Some participants invoked a counter discourse, offering a more nuanced view of making material more accessible to all students.

I mean we have this trouble in education from higher ed to lower ed, you know,

that this idea that they are just dumb. Or they can't learn it or something. Instead of, you know people who really work with the students, the international students, know that what they need is they just need some support. They need some of the cultural knowledge, some of the other additional pieces that they just don't have where they've come from. That has nothing to do with their intelligence level. (84.42)

Assigning Responsibility for Intercultural Learning and Adaptation

Questions of responsibility are a subtext to the deficit discourses. As discussed above, international students are sometimes represented as deficient when their behavior does not accord with the behaviors that have been normalized as “good student” behavior. Discourses of assimilation then assign responsibility to the students—essentially transferring the burden back onto them—such that they are expected to change their behavior to meet the local norms.

A common discursive strategy evident in the data involved the use of imaginative sympathy (Bennett, 1998). In the following excerpts, the speakers are putting themselves in the position of the international students, making judgments from their own perspective.

If I went abroad to study, in a language that wasn't my own, I would- I would just know going into that I was going to have to put in way more time than the native speakers of whatever language that was. And I would put in the time if I wanted to succeed. (99.54)

I come from a structure where the assumption is you choose to go to a school that's not from your home country, you then work with the language and the course work and the norms of that country. [...] If I need extra help in [the language] I better go find it on my own, you know. (85.6)

Responsibility is assigned to the student in both these excerpts. And in the second excerpt, it is clearly assigned solely to the student.

A related strategy involved the use of reminiscent sympathy (Bennett, 1998). One

staff participant spoke of an international faculty member who was an L2 English user.

He, interestingly, makes no accommodations for anyone. I mean he he just thinks it's, wrong. He is just believes in the austerity of the educational process, right? He does not move exams, he does not provide additional time, he doesn't give anyone who speaks, you know English as a second language, any extra slack. At all. Because *I think his impression is, nobody gave him that. And that's the way it has to be* [emphasis added], or something. (99.77)

Another staff member related a similar story. "One of my interactions with, [name], who is a non-native English speaker, is that she is often one who says they don't need any support. Kind of like, 'here is what, here's what I did and I did it well, and, so why can't everyone else do it?'" Both of these strategies absolve the university of some of its responsibility towards students that it admits—a responsibility to help ensure student success that might otherwise be attendant with an offer of admission. Interestingly, some of the staff participants who participated in this discursive strategy that assigned responsibility to the students did not at times seem to take on responsibility for their own intercultural learning.

There are also counter discourses that would assign responsibility to the institution or the faculty or share the burden among all parties, as illustrated in the following two interview excerpts:

[Internationalization] has to involve the university and the university students who are already here. [...] It can't be put on the you know the 1,200 international students here. That's a burden that they can't, that's not an achievable goal. That's not something they can do. It has to be a part, of, the University's entire-everybody has to be on board. (86.39)

I think people have to really fundamentally accept that it's not only, about those other people learning something, and changing who they are. But that it also—because it does include that—but it also includes they themselves recognizing, their role and their need to change. (89.47)

One staff member spoke at length on this topic. What emerged was a contested

view of whether or not faculty bore responsibility to develop intercultural competence to better equip them to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students and, if so, what UU's responsibility was with respect to providing opportunities for professional development in those areas.

E: I think we have to focus on the priorities in making sure that the internationalization is really about the students and focuses on students. Then facilitating international, you know, international networks for faculty. But I think faculty almost have an individual responsibility. I don't think it's the University's responsibility to make sure that faculty are internationalized. I think that's more of a departmental or individual fac- for faculty. [...] I think faculty also have a right to say I c- you know that's not what I do. But as an institution, and as units, and as leaders of units and departments and centers, of course. Then then those administrators- [...] if you're in some kind of policy or, curriculum decision-making capacity, then absolutely. You have a responsibility. But individual faculty and their research, I think that's up to them.

Kris: okay. What about in terms of, not just in terms of research but in terms of, intercultural communication, working with, people from different backgrounds, linguistic backgrounds cultural backgrounds.

E: Again I think the responsibility also rests to some extent to faculty too to acquire the tools and to train themselves, but also with the University to make that available and make it policy or at the very least sort of institutional culture, that we want our faculty to have some training and good understanding of how to deal with international students. And if we say we are internationalized institution, if we host international students, then that comes with a responsibility of preparing faculty and making sure that the students can succeed in our classrooms.

Constituting the Resource: Positive Representations of

International Undergraduates

In contrast to the representations of international students as a burden on the UU, there are also discourses circulating that constitute the students as resources. Their actual and potential contributions are framed in terms of the benefit to others students and to the institution. The students are variously positioned as cultural agents; as holders, co-creators, and sharers of knowledge; as diplomats; and as commodities. These discourses

exist side by side with the discourses of deficit, at times serving as counter discourses.

Cultural agent is one of the subject positions constructed for international students at UU. In this position international students are viewed as the bearers of cultural and linguistic knowledge that they willingly—and for the most part seemingly spontaneously—share with domestic students. An example of this view can be found in the final report from the task force on internationalization: “An important way to bring international experiences to our students, especially those who do not have an opportunity to study abroad, is to expose them to international students on our campus” (Task Force Final Report, p. 7). This view was echoed in interviews with UU staff, if sometimes somewhat qualified, as in this excerpt:

Part of what the international students are if they're of any value to our university at all in the School of [*name deleted*] ... I think these [domestic] students get something out of—or should get something out of, or could get something out of—being around, getting to know, learning about, international students. It will broaden them. (99.91)

Most often it is domestic students who are positioned as the beneficiaries of the international-students-as-cultural-agents. At times this benefit is extended to other members of the campus community:

It's really, creating a global [...] community, here on campus I really believe in that, and, for other students at the University to have kind of a global learning experience, through these [international] students being here in their classes and student activities, and becoming friends with them, and and so on. And so, um, so, you know global learning, in general, on our campus just through interaction, with these students, and then, you know and and for faculty too. I mean faculty and staff, have to, work with international students too and just, understanding how to, adjust the way you communicate or, how to be sensitive to, international students' needs and understand the various needs, they have compared to domestic students, that's a learning experience an international sort of learning experience for faculty and staff, as well. (28.22).

With this construction of international students, learning is generally described as

unidirectional—with others learning from the international students—rather than mutual, as would be the case in a synergistic approach to intercultural learning. In this next excerpt, it is the international students who bring an “enriching experience” to other students.

The whole spectrum of of students at the University is sort of all coming to international programs from different directions. So American students who want to, have an internationalized degree and go abroad, and then students with a diverse background, heritage speakers who have certain language and culture competencies for whom these degrees are great, and then international students who would bring an enormous sort of enriching experience to the students. (88.37)

However, the assumption that international students already possess intercultural knowledge, thereby having nothing to learn themselves, is challenged by one participant. Here, the subject position of intercultural learner is constructed for both domestic and international students:

Conducting programming that's designed to, you know enhance sort of global awareness, and not just for domestic students but for international students too because I think, a lot of times there is that misconception that if somebody comes from somewhere else, that they're au- automatically all intercultural and, you know and s- and have all those skills, which is not the case. (27.4)

Similarly, in the following excerpt, although the focus is initially on the resources that international students bring to courses and programs, the participant notes that all parties should participate in learning.

We send students abroad, and we don't put students together with the students who might be coming from the very countries to which we're sending students, so very concrete things. Or students interacting in their classes with, you know when you have an international focus course or course that has the international requirement designation [...]. Language courses, we have some higher-level language courses with heritage speakers or international students who, you know take the courses and even training faculty how you deal with that when you have courses that are content based but in the target language and then having native speakers. How do you deal with that in the classroom? [...] Often what happens is that we discourage students to join those classes, say, 'oh you're just gonna intimidate, the students who are learning the language.' Rather than saying, [...]

what a great resource. [...] So here are some things that I would think of are great ways, very concrete ways in which we could just be more conscious and more deliberate about the way in which we integrate students. Precisely not discouraging the native speakers but rather adapt our instruction accordingly and how we use them as a resource. And still for them also learning. (88.17, 88.20)

This view of international students as cultural agents may also at times include a move to place international students on an equal footing with domestic students, acknowledging them as bearers and co-creators of knowledge:

What if students had to do a class, where they interacted with international students not as sort of 'I'm the superior because I know the language,' but you could somehow equalize it, and have inter- you had to have some kind of an international (laughs) experience with, students where, you- they- you had to learn something about their culture. (94.34)

One participant gave a specific example of cultural knowledge that business students might learn from one another "I said, 'so, do we ever teach [the domestic students] how to interact, when they go to a business lunch in Japan?' 'Well no, no we don't really talk about that.' I said, 'but do we have any Japanese international students here who could maybe help them with that?'" (84.116).

It may be argued that the cultural agent subject position constituted by the discourse could be considered a commoditized position. One participant spoke against such a positioning: "I'd like to work [...] on, [...] how faculty, you know can, [...] use international students to integrate an international perspective into class discussions, without putting them on the spot or making them the representative of their culture," (27.2). There are other perhaps clearer examples of international students being constructed as commodities, as in these two excerpts: "I mean I think the University says, 'whoa! We've got a lot of international students and our faculty is complaining and a lot of them are failing out so we lose money. How do we fix that?'" (84.68).

If you're not a citizen, you can't (laughs) be a resident, you know? So, that means a certain kind of income stream. Seven years ago, I heard then [senior vice president] talking about right before the- or right during those crises, budget crises, 'we need 200 more international students a year and, you know we'll be in a much better budgetary circumstance' (89.51).

Here the subject position of international students as commodity appears within a marketized discourse of higher education.

Another subject position created for international students was the diplomat. This position has ties to an imperial or colonial discourse of higher education and to institutional branding and commercial trade rationales, as evident in the following two interview excerpts:

And then the connections, you know that [international students] can build, for the community as well and, well for the University but then also the, the, you know greater, sort of Utah community in a sense for business and trade and, you know, all of that once they, graduate from the University and then are, you know, maybe back in, China, and, you know will always have this sort of fond memory of Utah and, of connections here and, if they are a business leader then, in China whatever that they then use that to really create, you know more of these kinds of business relationships and so on, so. So that's kind of what I see as, as sort of sort of a, you know that's why we want, international students here. Um, you know and- but obviously it sh- it should be something that's of mutual benefit. (28.6)

You know what the value is if they go home? That they learned something about America. And that we've Americanized their brain if we think that's valuable for us. And they will never be a person who goes to that back to that country and brooks, allows, or participates in anti-American rhetoric or political movement, right. Because these are people that you think to yourself, they're gonna say, 'look I know lots of Americans. They're nice people. I had a good time there.' And that's good for us. Right? That's a good thing, to be thought of that way around the world by educated people. It has to be. Right? So I guess there's that too. (99.89)

Language and Culture: Discourses of Il/Legitimacy

Discourses constituting the "good student" serve to legitimate or normalize particular sets of culturally conditioned behaviors over other sets of behaviors. Students who participate in class, see faculty during office hours, and critically engage with course

material are constructed as good students. Competing constructions of the “good student”—for example, the student who does not question what she does not understand, who works hard to identify the right answer from readings and lectures, and who is careful to respect her professors in ways she has been culturally conditioned to do so—do not have legitimacy in this same context. There are also discourses of legitimacy and illegitimacy with respect to languages and language use.

The international students participants in my study all have multilingual resources, but their languages do not necessarily enjoy equal status in all contexts. In their descriptions of the ways they use their linguistic resources, and the contexts in which they use them, the unequal position of the languages became evident. So even though the students all described engaging in translanguaging at UU, making use of their various codes or repertoires as needed (and as allowed), their choices were constrained in some contexts.

LOTEs were reportedly often used with compatriots in social situations or during group work, as long as everyone or most people in the group shared the language. For some of the students, the LOTE that they share with some friends and classmates may not even be their home dialect: “I just said Pu- Putonghua yeah (laughs) ... because if I say my dialect, then no one can understand” (Dan II, 96.1). Some of the IUGs mentioned using their L1 for learning purposes. “I actually I think sometimes my thinking is Chinese, Chinese style. So I, I, study type is Chinese, Chinese style so, I should learn that, by Chinese but, when I when I took the exam I should, transfer to English to express” (Dan I, 93.21). In this case, Dan added to his linguistic repertoire, building his academic vocabulary in both Chinese and English. Students also reported reading in their L1 to

build background knowledge and help access a difficult English text. But use of their L1 has not always been accepted.

In one case, while writing a paper, Pam had attempted to use a source in a LOTE but was told by her instructor that she could not do so. Her understanding of the reason for not being allowed to use it was that it was in Chinese (and not English)—even though the topic of the paper was about Chinese languages:

I was in the ESL class and, I was talking about, there is the last topic is about the, whether Cantonese is a language or dialect. And I used, I used kind of just some Chinese resource and I asked my teacher how to, uh uh (*Kris: cite*) cite them? Yeah how to cite them. And he was like- uh she was like, ‘ummmm...’ I forgot what she said but it was like, uh maybe ‘if you can’t cite them you probably won’t use them.’ And I was like, ‘mmm, but it’s important. It can prove my views, my opinions. Why I can’t use them?’ She said, ‘because it’s Chinese!’ And I was like, ‘Mmm? Okay...’ Yeah. So. That’s kind of, not good.” (Pam I, 92.54)

Other IUGs seemed to be regulating their own language use under the hegemony of English, suggesting a discourse of the illegitimacy of LOTEs. Amber described using a Chinese source only one time but generally feeling that it wouldn’t be acceptable because the professor wouldn’t be able to read it. The following excerpt from our conversation can be viewed in terms of both the unequal status of languages at UU and Amber’s own subjectivity:

Kris: Do you use any Chinese sources if you’re writing a paper?

Amber: Uh not exactly because, if- I used once I guess. And I I did the citation. And I hardly use it because it’s in Chinese and professor won’t understand what’s that so.

Kris: [intake of breath] ... Mmm.

Amber: do you think it’s fine? To use them

Kris: well, I’m interested in knowing what the profe- your professors would think. You know.

Amber: yeah but-

Kris: have you ever asked any or talked to any professors about that?

Amber: oh [not yet? / no yeah?]. Because I, I I was I was afraid I- to do something wrong so I (Kris: mm-hm, yeah) I hardly use Chinese citations. (Kris: yeah right) yeah.

Kris: so the one time that you did use it did the professor say anything?

Amber: no I I used it but it's in Chine- English. The (Kris: right) website is in English but, (Kris: right) it's a Chinese website (Kris: right). Yeah. Some some like some authors write something in English (Kris: okay), so he can still understand. (Kris: okay) yeah.

Kris: okay. But um, so when you're writing a paper, if you're, ... It is possible to read something in Chinese and you might paraphrase it in English, or you might if you want even if you want to do a quotation you could translate the quotation into English.

Amber: yeah but I was thinking like, if I do the citation, (Kris: mm-hm) and it's still, it the website is still like showed up in Chinese maybe the professor won't understand.

Clearly, Amber was afraid that using a LOTE as a source for a paper might be construed as doing something wrong. She even worried about the one source that she did use because, even though it was in English, it came from a Chinese website. She was co-constructing the discourse of illegitimacy of LOTE for academic purposes at UU. At the same time, she was positioning herself with respect to the manipulator/cheater subject position discussed above. That's a subject position she rejected. Her decision not to use sources in LOTE can be seen as a move to position herself as a good and honest student, avoiding a behavior that could get her positioned as a cheater.

We continued our conversation:

Kris ... have you ever had a professor tell you, 'it's okay you can cite sources from- in Chinese or any other language'? Has anybody said that?

Amber: no only when I was in [ESL] 1060 [Expository Writing for ESL], and the

teacher said um, we cannot use resources in in other languages.

Kris: did the teacher say why?

Amber: Mm, I don't know, yeah I don't know.

Kris: give a reason?

Amber: yeah. (Kris: okay.) So I, so I hardly use it (Kris: right), yeah.

Kris: right. Yeah. Yeah I think it's um, if you ever want to use, you know if you find a source in Chinese you think would be useful, um, my suggestion would be just ask the professor.

When I asked Amber about this incident in our next interview her description was quite similar to the experience that Pam had related:

The source I I found this in Chinese and, I didn't, exactly know how to, paraphrase it. I didn't really good at it so, I don't want to take the risk. And the teacher said, 'if you're not really make sure you can, you can like, um, put the Chinese sources into it, maybe you you don't need to try it,' like that. Because the the sources is totally in Chinese, so. (Amber II, 87.28)

Another student did not need anyone to tell him explicitly that he should only use English. He recognized the monolingual bias and status of English—underscored by the lack of resources available in Chinese—and regulated his language use accordingly:

Kris: have you ever cited the Chinese [source]? Or do you only cite English sources?

Dan: only cite English.

Kris: okay. Why why is that?

Dan: because if I cite a Chinese, cause I don't, I don't know if the professor understand it. Yeah if they want to look at reference, yeah.

Kris: okay. Have you ever asked a professor if it's okay to, use a Chinese source?

Dan: no but I think, he c- but I- I don't think so cause, because if if the professor understand Chinese, he would speak Chinese with me (laughs). Yeah. But but anyway so, I think if I use Chinese to person who cannot speak Chinese it may be kind of impolite. (Kris: oh okay.) Yeah. So, we need to be polite. So we need we

need use English. English is connection, right.

Kris: right right. Have any of your professors ever said like all the sources need to be in English? Or, sources can be in other languages? Did anybody ever say that?

Dan: uhh, maybe they said that but I didn't, notice that. Yeah.

Kris: okay. Okay.

Dan: oh! Yeah that's that's another thing. So it's it's really hard for me to find the Chinese reference. Yeah in in our library. (Kris: oh okay.) Yeah. We can find in some Chinese website but it's, unbelievable (laughs).

Kris: oh yeah yeah yeah. You need a, academic source, right?

Dan: yeah yeah academic source.

Kris: oh. So,

Dan: we can find some but very, not much.

These examples illustrate the regulatory or disciplinary effects of discourse. When I brought these incidents up in interviews with UU staff, it was interesting to hear the different reactions and the way that languages, knowledge, and international students were constructed. In the first excerpt, international students are constructed as (potential) cheaters:

Sometimes when faculty say things to me about their international students, I want to say, 'you just don't remember when that happened with your domestic students.' Like, because it did! It's just that they've either gotten used to it, and they've sort of dismissed it as normal now, and and this feels new, because there's a, a, a bunch of them, right? [...] Or it's different from what they experienced before. It looks different from what they saw, from their American students. And, and so, so they have this perception, that then gets reinforced when they are looking for it. And so I can imagine, *I can imagine professors being suspicious that they, you know that they would make it up. They wouldn't want to take the time to really find a source. Honestly, some of my students are kind of lazy, I would be suspicious, that that would give them an easy way to make up a source-like, 'now I can just make up the source. It was, it was written by Kim in 2020. Like I don't even have to, think very hard [emphasis added].'* (84.81-82)

The constituting power of discourse is evident in the potential of the representation of

international students as cheaters to impact pedagogical decisions:

I would think, that the newer student- when they're first here, their first couple of years—this is reverse for how their language development actually happens—but it seems like for the first little bit it would be beneficial for them to use English so that the professors knew they weren't cheating, or copying. That they knew how to cite sources. Like I would I would think some professors would be suspect when they see a Chinese source, this is just my opinion. [...] But then language development—wise it would be better for them to be citing sources in their native language, you know. (84.78)

In the next two excerpts, the participants reject the discourse of illegitimacy of LOTEs.

Kris: did you either encourage or allow students to use the source material in languages other than English?

[UU staff]: yeah. They definitely could. It's an international class. Um, and uh, they may not need it for this assignment, but certainly they definitely could. What I would only ask for is for my own information like if it's a URL, is to just please translate the URL. (Kris: right.) So that I (laughs) have a sense of what the source is. (85.18)

This second participant not only rejects the discourse of illegitimacy, but she also offers an explanation of the relational power constituted through the discourse:

I think probably a lot of professors will say no. Maybe citing the reason of it being in another language but the idea that valid research can come out of universities in other languages is probably what's more in their head. That you know that, oh! It's out of Australia okay. But it's out of a, you know, Beijing Normal, we're not going to find as much validity in that. Which I think is probably a bias that, threads more through the University than we think. But I don't know I'm just guessing that. (97.13)

This last UU staff member explicitly tells her students in the ESL writing class that it is okay for them to use sources in LOTEs. She shows them how to cite the sources and even how to search for them in the library databases. This is one of the ways that she supports and encourages translanguaging in her classroom and constructs a counter-discourse—one of legitimacy of LOTEs:

And when they ask me I'm like sure why not. I mean I'm not- it I think it goes along with a lot of other things in my class. You know I'm not opposed to them speaking their language at times, I'm not I'm not shutting down all their modes of

communication, I don't want to shut down any access or opportunities they have for learning, so. And if they're doing something on a very complex topic that they can't understand in English, you know what's what's the harm in allowing them to read up on it in Chinese, as long they can you know explain it in English. (97.7)

As a counter to the discourse of illegitimacy, this discourse of legitimacy of LOTE and of translanguaging practices circulates in additional ways at UU. A new program at UU called Culture and Language Across the Curriculum (CLAC) offers opportunities for students to learn academic content through LOTE. A staff participant described the CLAC model as

a way to bring together the different, the different types of, different levels of language learners and international students who are in the course learning significant content and reading texts in the target language that are of interest and beneficial to students of all, from you know from, intermed- we kind of set it at the intermediate level, advanced but also native speakers or heritage speakers or speakers of a very closely related language. (88.23)

The description on the CLAC website clearly demonstrates a positive orientation to translanguaging and positions the use of LOTE as something that can happen outside language classrooms:

The ability to communicate in another language and with other cultures is typically associated with foreign language degrees and immersive experiences abroad. However, to make the achievement of intercultural competence possible for all students, CLAC programs integrate different languages and cultures into a variety of curricular contexts beyond the traditional foreign language classroom. (<http://l2trec.utah.edu/language-services/clac.php>)

The UU staff member describes the impact the program seems to be having on interest in language learning. The following excerpt, together with the two previous ones, represents a legitimization of the use of LOTE at UU:

Our greatest advocate for language study are people in other departments – in history, in political science, and communication – for, for different reasons. But they are like out there. “We gotta get these students to use their language!” And you know they don't have to be language majors but you know, we're going to tell them to take our CLAC trailer and then tell them, “next time, take a course in

Spanish in the Spanish program.” And suddenly these people have become the greatest advocates for language! (88.32)

This chapter explored issues of identity and representation as performed discourse through language. Notable findings include evidence of shifting identities of international students; the use of lexical labels and the power relations inscribed in them; and competing discourses that created subject positions for the students and legitimacy for a normalized set of behaviors. I continue my discussion of these findings, and how they relate to the literature, in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the conceptualizations and experiences of internationalization of several individuals at the University of Utah. Special attention was paid to participants' experiences either as or working with international undergraduates at UU, the role of language and culture in internationalization at UU, and discourses that inform and are informed by the participants' perspectives. Learning about people's actual experiences at an internationalizing university—their successes, frustrations, opinions, suggestions, and so forth—can help shape future policies and strategies to improve the intercultural learning and competence necessary for UU to meet its goals for internationalization and global engagement. Though no claim is made to the generalizability of the experiences of the individual participants, insight into their experiences serves several purposes. Isolated examples may be indicators of more widespread issues, including both difficulties that need to be addressed and approaches that have worked well for some and may be helpful for others. They also help identify areas for further research, which may include research into how widespread some of the issues experienced by these participants are at UU. In addition, focusing on the individual experiences of a small group of participants underscores the importance of considering individual differences (Lazarus, 1997) among students and faculty and not generalizing based on nationality, ethnicity, or discipline. Taking these differences into account can

help develop a nuanced approach to internationalization and intercultural learning based on the diverse needs of the UU community.

One of the most striking impressions I am left with at the end of this research is the amount that everyone I talked to—students, faculty, administrators, and staff—cares. They care about the people at UU, the institution, their disciplines, and teaching and learning. The students are working very hard to learn challenging content through what for many is an unfamiliar culture and an additional language. Faculty and administrators so want to do what is right for everyone—if they only knew what that was. My analyses and discussion, then, should be read not as an indictment of any people or practices but as a portrait of the struggles and successes of a caring group of individuals who are subject to the discourses as they take up subject positions in them.

In this chapter, I discuss the findings presented in Chapters IV and V and their implications with respect to the research questions, listed below. The discussion is framed by the concepts of discourse, subjectivity, and cultural synergy that informed this study.

1. How do study participants describe their experiences as UU students, faculty, administrators, and staff in a culturally and linguistically diverse university context? What dilemmas are evident in those experiences?
2. How do participants conceive of the internationalization of higher education? How do they see internationalization playing out at UU?
3. What are the discourses that help shape and are shaped by the participants' conceptualizations and experiences of IHE?
 - a. What subjectivities are ascribed to, taken up by, and resisted by the international undergraduate participants at UU?
 - b. How is language talked about and used among the participants at UU?

Discussion of Participant Experiences at UU

The stories of the paths that the student participants took to UU illustrate the diversity of experience among a group of students who are all from the same geographical region. These students, who are all from East Asia (i.e., China, Korea, and Thailand), all prepared in some way for their study abroad experience before leaving their home countries, but no two paths were quite the same. Amber and Dan both attended university courses in China, yet only Amber was a matriculated student in China; she is also the only transfer student in the group. Xuefang and Zhong attended the same preparatory program in Beijing, but Zhong took an extra year to finish high school and sat for the college entrance exam (*gaokao*) in China whereas Xuefang finished high school in just 2 years and regretted not having taken the *gaokao*.³³ Following her preparatory program, Xuefang enrolled in the Global Pathways Program. Nan, on the other hand, enrolled in Global Pathways immediately after high school. Unlike the other students, Pam did not use the services of an agent or enroll in any kind of preparatory program. She navigated the application system on her own and worked on her English mainly on her own, as well, taking just a few short courses in English.

Fanfeng, Donghyun, and Jiyeong are all permanent residents of the USA, and Kamon is a U.S. citizen, but they all self-identified—at least some of the time—as international students. That is where their similarities end. Kamon was born in the USA, raised in Thailand, and attended high school in New Zealand before being admitted to UU as a domestic student. Fanfeng and Donghyun both entered the USA as international

³³ The regret that Xuefang felt at not having taken the *gaokao*, which she viewed as a rite of passage, may be explained by the Chinese cultural concept of learning as a character-developing ordeal (Li, 2003). It is important to recognize that all students at UU arrive with orientations to learning that are developed through socialization in particular cultural contexts and are influenced by individual differences.

students on F-1 visas but have both since obtained green cards. Donghyun attended middle school in China and high school in the USA, and his entire family eventually immigrated here. Fanfeng first studied English in New York before being admitted to UU. Jiyeong also began her studies in New York, but she already had an undergraduate degree from her home country of Korea. She is quite a bit older than the other students and could be considered a nontraditional student.

The differences in the cultural backgrounds of the students may have contributed to both different expectations before they arrived at UU and differences in their experiences and the way they interpret those experiences. Culture has been defined as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes one group or category of people from another” (Hofstede, 1994, p. 40) and “a system of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and acting” (Goodenough, 1981, p. 110). In this research I have been particularly interested in the way cultures of learning mediate the communication, practices, and participation of students and teachers (Jin & Cortazzi, 2001) at UU. The participants all learned how to be a student within specific cultures of learning.

Many of the students indicated that they were surprised at how difficult it was for them to be students at UU and how heavy the workload was. They had worked hard in their home countries to prepare. For example, Dan had taken biology courses at a local university and also enrolled in English courses, and Xuefang, Zhong, Nancy, and Amber had enrolled in special programs designed to prepare students for college study in the USA. Their expectations for college life, however, were often shaped by what they knew about college in their home countries, where students were rewarded with undemanding programs after the hard work of high school and university entrance exams. One student

even said that she almost regretted her decision to study in the USA because it has been so difficult for her. The surprise that many of these students initially felt at the difficulty level of studying at UU might have been mitigated with a more comprehensive preparation that included a focus on intercultural learning in general and a specific orientation to the new culture of learning.

Amber expected to be able to transfer most of the credits she earned from the 2 years she spent at a university in China. She was shocked when she learned that her credits did not transfer, due to the lack of articulation agreement between UU and her university in China. After spending what she considered to be an excessive amount of time and effort to transfer the credits from one math course—an additional shock for a student not accustomed to doing things like that on her own in her home culture of learning—she gave up on trying to transfer any others, preferring to retake the courses. Kamon also expressed frustration at having to take a calculus class that was far too easy for him after having had 3 years of calculus in high school.

Amber's and Kamon's experiences suggest the need for further research into the experiences of international transfer students to find out how frequent problems of this sort are and, if needed, develop better options for international transfers students. Further research could also examine the issue in terms of cultural capital: To what extent does course work from universities outside the USA possess institutionalized cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986), and what are the implications of differential amounts of capital?

The students reported several other experiences at UU that differed from their expectations or their experiences as students in their home cultures. Many of the differences in cultures of learning centered around behavioral norms for students and

faculty and the underlying beliefs that inform the practices and behaviors. The lack of fixed schedules, the personal responsibility required to select and register for courses, the amount of work required of students, the expectation that students participate in class, and the emphasis placed on questioning are some of the most salient differences discussed by the students. Taking care not to generalize students on the basis of national culture, the research that has been conducted into value orientations or cultural patterns (Samovar, Porter, McDaniel, & Roy, 2013) can help explain the underpinnings of some of the differences that the students described. It can also advance our understandings of the potential difficulties that students may face when adjusting to a new culture of learning.

It is possible that the differences that the students noticed between the culture of learning at UU and the cultures of learning they were raised in were affected, at least in part, by the value dimensions of individualism/collectivism and power distance. The USA has been found to score very high in individualism (Hofstede, 1980), emphasizing individual rights and responsibility and freedom of self-expression, among other characteristics. China, on the other hand, is said to score very high in collectivism (<http://geert-hofstede.com/china.html>), emphasizing community, the needs of the in-group over individual needs, and face (i.e., self-image and other image) maintenance. In such societies, group identification tends to be strong, with individuals showing great loyalty that extends to family members, employers, and other groups. Power distance refers to the degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed unequally, and China has been scored at the end of the power distance continuum demonstrating a strong expectation for an unequal distribution of power, whereas the

USA has a much lower power distance culture (Hofstede, 1980; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004).

Two specific examples from my interviews with Pam—her orientation to different types of learning and her questioning behavior—further illustrate the impact of cultural values on behavior. As described in Chapter IV, Pam sees memorizing and understanding as two different types of learning with different uses. Memorization is sometimes necessary to perform well on tests, particularly in the case where understanding has not yet been achieved. So memorization may, in that case, be a precursor to understanding. Pam's tendency to wait until after class to ask questions might be explained by a combination of individual characteristics and cultural conditioning. Pam has described herself as a quiet person, and she also said that what began as a reluctance to ask questions during class due to language anxiety developed into a habit. Added to her personal characteristics may be the influence of the role of asking questions in her culture of learning. She described her school experience in China as being very different compared to her experience at UU with respect to the expectations and opportunities for students to speak during class. Whereas at UU her instructors sometimes ask students questions that they expect to be answered, and encourage students to ask their own questions, in China she said that her high school teachers never really gave the students a chance to speak; they even answered their own rhetorical questions.

The expectations that students participate in class discussions, offer opinions, and even question instructors and texts are all in keeping with the value that the dominant culture in the USA places on individualism and low power distance. These values orientations create conditions in a culture of learning that make it possible for authority to

be questioned and individual opinions to be valued. There is a different set of values operating in the dominant culture in China that creates a different culture of learning.

According to Jin and Cortazzi (1997/1998), “what Westerners are prone to call ‘rote learning’ may be seen by Chinese as part of a longer educational progression in which memory comes first, to be followed later by understanding and questioning” (p. 49). Memorization is an important first step to learning in Chinese cultures of learning and is thought to be a necessary precursor to critical thinking and creativity (but does not supplant them). Pam may have experienced this approach to learning in China, whether or not the purpose of memorization as the foundation to understanding was made explicit.

The relationship between asking questions and learning is also viewed differently in the West and in China, where asking questions is more commonly done after learning, as a reflective practice, than as a heuristic applied during learning. Several other cultural factors may influence this behavior, including Confucian values, power distance, and face maintenance. The relatively high power distance observed in Chinese culture (Hofstede, 1986), with teachers afforded a higher status than students, can be explained by the Confucian concept of filial piety. Jin and Cortazzi (1997/1998) explain that asking teachers questions during class may be considered disrespectful for a number of reasons: Good teachers will have anticipated students’ questions, so students will listen patiently and attentively until the end of class; good teachers are highly knowledgeable, so if a student asks a question that a teacher cannot answer, the teacher will lose face; if students, whose duty it is to respect teachers, cause a teacher to lose face, they will lose face themselves. It should be noted that any or all of these values that shape behaviors in Chinese cultures of learning may be beneath the conscious awareness of the students, so

even if they apply to Pam's case, she may have a general sense that asking questions is not appropriate behavior without thinking about the underlying values.

The importance to UU faculty and students of understanding the influence of values and cultures of learning is not necessarily to be able to map specific behaviors to underlying values, to predict behaviors, or to make generalizations based on national cultures. What it is important to learn is that differences in accepted or normalized behaviors exist according to cultural values. Resources such as the guide published by Carnegie Mellon University on cultural variations in the classroom (Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence and Intercultural Communication Center, n.d.) can help faculty develop a sense for the range of expectations and behaviors across cultures of learning and an understanding of factors that motivate those behaviors. This awareness can help faculty better understand the challenges that their students may face in adapting to the new culture of learning. I will return to this topic below in the discussion of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching.

Several of the students I interviewed talked about the support they received from friends, particularly when they first arrived here, and some specifically mentioned relying on people from their home countries. What some of the UU staff participants remarked upon as the tendency of "international students [...] to hang together" may actually play a very important role in their adjustment to the new culture. Social support has been found to be helpful in the early stages of adaptation to a new culture (Kim, 2105). Specifically within higher education, Bartram (2008) found that social support from peers was very important to British and Dutch students studying abroad. The students in my study turned to their peers for both social and academic support. In Pam's case, she relied on friends

who were more knowledgeable in physics than she was in two circumstances: when she felt that her professors were too busy to answer her questions or when her TA could not answer her question to her satisfaction. Several other participants also mentioned receiving help at times from students with whom they did not share a home culture or language.

Like the international students in the study by Ramsay, Barker, and Jones (1999), many of the students in my study commented positively on support they received from UU resources. In addition to seeking help from their professors or friends, they often took advantage of Writing Center and inexpensive academic tutoring services available on campus. These behaviors also indicate that they were developing a comfort level in using a broad range of resources and avoiding overreliance on their compatriots, which could slow their intercultural learning and adaptation to UU (Kim, 2015). However, there were services that some of the students were not aware of. Donghyun, for example, experienced a mentoring program in the middle school he attended as an international student in China. He suggested that a similar program might help promote interaction among students from diverse cultures at UU. When I asked whether he was familiar with the two mentoring programs that the International Student and Scholar Services offered, he said he was not. Similarly, Amber did not know about the ESL course designed to help students with the American History course that she found so difficult. These examples indicate a need at UU for better advising and communication with international students to make sure that they are aware of all of the resources available to them. As several UU staff participants indicated, this kind of information needs to be communicated to students on an on-going basis rather than only during the international orientation when

students may be overloaded with information.

The international student³⁴ and UU staff participants tended to agree that the biggest challenges the students faced were language related. As Dan stated, subject matter knowledge was not a problem for him; “The problem is language and culture” (Dan I, 93.43). A similar view was heard from the UU Staff:

- “It really is a language barrier. [...] It’s really the language more than the general knowledge about the topic” (UU Staff H, 94.7).
- “I fundamentally think it’s mostly language competency” (UU Staff J, 85.32).
- “International students [...] are really really really behind many of them in English skills.” (UU Staff I, 99.37)

The students indicated difficulty with speaking (particularly asking questions or voicing opinions in class, as noted above), listening to lectures, reading course material, and writing assignments. Many of them noted the progress they had made in their time at UU, generally framing their discussions of language use in terms of how difficult their initial experiences at UU were, but how things had gotten a little easier for them as they adjusted and improved their English proficiency. Their use of cognitive, metacognitive, and socioaffective strategies seems to have contributed to their success. Most of the students described their use of resourcing, planning, self-management, questioning, and cooperation strategies (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994). These students, then, serve as successful examples of strategic learners; it may be fruitful to conduct research with less successful students to determine whether more strategy instruction could help them improve their learning.

³⁴ As discussed in Chapter V, international students are often positioned as L2 English users or ESL students, but that is a discourse that I am problematizing. It is therefore important to keep in mind the fact that, while English was not the first or dominant language for any of the student participants in this study, there are international students at UU for whom communicating in English represents no particular challenges.

The problems Dan mentioned with language and culture suggest a few adjustments that could be made to teaching at UU. First, instructors can follow another one of the tenets of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007) by taking advantage of students' background knowledge and using it as a scaffold for development of new content and linguistic knowledge. They can also provide students with more opportunities for interaction, which would promote both intercultural communication and the social construction of knowledge. Another option is to create more language support courses or materials tailored to specific courses, majors, departments, or disciplines. Dan, who understood the concepts in his biology courses and was learning the discipline-specific vocabulary on his own, might benefit from a course that focused on language used in instructions and descriptions of processes in scientific discourse. It could help him better understand the steps that he needed to follow in the lab experiments and the way to write about them in lab reports.

These types of EAP courses that focused on specific academic discourse were found to be more helpful to international undergraduate students at an Australian university than were general ESL courses (Baik & Greig, 2009). Many of my student participants indicated that they would be interested in EAP courses like these that would help them develop language specifically related to their other course work. However, Donghyun noted that students might not want to take additional courses that were not required, even though he had a friend who found the ESL course attached to the American history course to be very helpful. There would need to be a way to incentivize disciplinary specific courses to make them more attractive to the students.

What emerged as one of the central tensions in the interviews was a contested

view about the source of the differences—often constructed as difficulties or problems by students and staff participants alike—between behaviors of culturally and linguistically diverse students and the expected behaviors for students at UU. At issue was the role played by language and by culture—that is, by linguistic differences and cultural differences. As noted previously, many participants were quick to name language as the key challenge for international students who are L2 English users, and some even downplayed the role of culture or expressed doubt or uncertainty as to its effects.

Some participants did problematize the language-as-key-factor view by attempting to take cultural differences—particularly with respect to cultures of learning—into account.

It's both you know their language skills are not good- their English language skills are not good enough. [...] And I also think it has to do with these cultural expectations, the American system which is maybe different from what they came from. So they're trying to figure that out, as well. [...] It's on many different levels. (UU Staff H, 94.16)

But even these views were expressed with a sense of frustration at not knowing which differences or difficulties were attributable to language and which to culture. I found myself struggling with the same question. However, I have come to believe that it is not possible to tease out all of the effects of language and culture or to draw the line where language ends and culture begins because these two factors are inextricably linked. As described by Crichton and Scarino, (2007) “the interrelationship between language and culture [...] shapes all aspects of experience in education and more generally, [...] essentially involves the interaction between people, and [...] is multiple and variable” (p. 4.12). Just as cultures are neither monolithic nor fixed, and subjectivities are not stable or singular, so the influence of culture(s) on individual student behavior cannot be described

in a uniform way. It is impossible to state with certainty that all students from a given national culture will behave in a particular way, will have been socialized in identical cultures of learning, or will have difficulty understanding a particular text because they lack knowledge about its structure or the intertextual references it makes. As noted above where I speculated on possible explanations for some of Pam's learning behaviors, the goal of intercultural understanding is not—cannot be—to enable one to make generalizations about or to essentialize people based on cultural group membership. Crichton and Scarino advocate “acknowledging that our understanding of others is not ‘given in advance,’ but that interaction and communication involve the continuous interpretation and making of meaning between individuals” (p. 4.12).

The challenging experiences with English use the students reported were sometimes accompanied by anxiety. Many of the students described their reluctance to ask questions or participate in discussions in class for fear that they would make a mistake or not be understood. That fear was not entirely unfounded as one student related an incident she witnessed in which a professor asked a student to “translate” for a Chinese student whose question he did not understand (see Chapter IV). One of the UU staff participants also commented on the emotional risks of L2 use and the threat to learning that negative emotions pose. She and another staff member spoke of the need to create safe communities in their classrooms. These perspectives are in line with the literature on affect—particularly anxiety (Arnold, 1999; Horwitz & Young, 1991)—in L2 learning. Graham (1997), for example, found that A-level French and German learners were afraid of coming across as foolish when they talked to their L1 French- or German-speaking language assistants. They felt that their L2 French and German speech would be

obviously inadequate in comparison to the speech of the L1 French and German speakers. Other researchers have found L2 learners comparing themselves unfavorably to L1 speakers, often resulting in anxiety or other forms of negative affect (Ehrman, 1996; Wenden, 1991).

I found a similar situation with one of my student participants. Jiyeong seemed conflicted over the idea of working with students from non-Asian backgrounds. She described Americans as kind and stated that she could always find an American student who would answer her questions, but she also related a few negative experiences she had had with L1 English speakers. Because of those experiences, and her perception of how other students viewed her, she said she felt more comfortable working in groups with other international students. She also stated that international students were always eager to work with her because, having been in the USA for so many years, her English was comparatively better than theirs.

Another way to interpret the avoidance behavior that the students reported is as a manifestation of a low willingness to communicate (WTC). Though originally conceived of as a relatively stable personality trait, WTC has been reconceptualized as a situational variable (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre, Dornyei, Clement, & Noels, 1998). MacIntyre et al. (1998) define WTC as “readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons using an L2” (p. 547). MacIntyre (1994) determined that one of the key variables contributing to people’s WTC is their self-perception of their communicative competence. Perceived competence together with the level of anxiety in a given situation are key components of self-confidence. MacIntyre et al. (1998) posit several additional contributing factors to WTC, including factors related to motivation,

the affective–cognitive context, and the social and individual context. Thus, it appears that WTC is mediated by anxiety and one’s perception of her communicative competence in a given context.

The lack of confidence that Pam and Amber had in their English proficiency, and their anxiety that they would not be understood if they spoke out in class, contributed negatively to their WTC. They chose to remain silent in the context of the classroom, where many people were present and would hear them speak, preferring to hold any questions they had until after class when they could interact with their professors one-on-one, reducing the anxiety somewhat. When her self-perceived communicative competence improved, increasing her self-confidence, Amber began speaking out more in class. Pam stated that she had gotten into the habit of asking her questions after class rather than during class, but it may also be the case that her communication apprehension—a less robust causative variable in MacIntyre’s (1994) WTC model—derived from her introverted nature (“I’m kind of quiet girl normally,” [Pam 2, 90.47]) played a role in continuing this behavior. Jiyeong’s self-confidence appeared to be heavily influenced by her interpretation of how she was positioned by others, with her WTC much greater when she thought she would be perceived as a competent and knowledgeable English speaker.

These findings are in keeping with Murphey, Chen, and Chen’s (2004) claim that students need successful learning experiences in order to create (positive) identities and to identify with a social group. The WTC model also supports the notion that safe spaces need to be created in classrooms in order to lower anxiety and raise self-confidence in students. Jiyeong said she had had few opportunities to work with American students on

group projects, so more carefully structured opportunities for her to do so may contribute positively to her self-confidence and her subjectivity. One of the staff participants asked how supportive conditions might be created in a university setting: “I’ve thought a lot about how, you know how important that is to have, an atmosphere where you can learn and make mistakes, and grow, but how do you do that in a university climate?” (UU Staff H, 94.18). Another staff member shared her approach to community building in the classroom:

Early on I decided that, our community and our classroom had to be, you know a priority. That if we are going- if I’m gonna have all these different, people with different backgrounds different ideas of what our expectations are we need to make all those things clear right away. And they also need to be able to support each other. Um and you know feel a responsibility towards one ea- toward one another. [...] The more supported they feel, it’s gonna lead to I think increased extrinsic motivation, for them. [...] They also leave, kind of with this idea that you know class is about, you know they have they have these new friends, they have these new supportive communities, they are not isolated in their own world which I feel like a lot of international students feel very isolated. (UU Staff G, 86.3)

As I will discuss below in the implications section, creating a supportive classroom that provides a sense of community is an essential part of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching (Hafernik & Wiant, 2012; Prater & Devereaux, 2009; Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007).

Weedon (2004) notes the constitutive role that language plays in subjectivity and identity. “It is in the process of using language—whether as thought or speech—that we take up positions as speaking and thinking subjects and the identities that go with them” (p. 18). This view of subjectivity is evident in the above example of Jiyeong, whose subjectivity shifted between proficient English speaker other students wanted to work with and a (possibly racialized) Other that was not as proficient in English as the students

she referred to as “Caucasians.”

Several staff participants mentioned interactions they had with colleagues in which those colleagues had named pronunciation as the key or the only problem that international students needed to overcome. At times, it seemed that *language* may have been functioning as a proxy for other differences, either minimizing the role that culture might play in the international students’ adjustment to UU or masking forms of discrimination (Gallagher, Haan, & Varandani, 2015; Hill, 2008; Kubota, 1999). It would also be worthwhile to explore this theme with further research to determine whether the stated communication problems—particularly those attributed to “accent”—inhered in the speaker or in listeners who may have rejected their share of the communicative burden (Lippi-Green, 2012) due to attitudes regarding “accented” English (Cargile, 2015; Lippi-Green, 2012).

As UU staff members spoke during interviews about their experiences working with international students, several themes emerged. In Chapter IV, I described some of the tensions and frustrations these participants felt regarding their roles and responsibilities on campus and their perspectives on language, culture, and intercultural learning. The interviews included expressions of uncertainty over how best to help culturally and linguistically diverse students learn and what role culture played in their students’ behavior. There were also calls for more support and direction from their own departments or from UU in general, and there was talk about the learning opportunities that result from a diverse student body. Some UU staff also pointed out what they saw as misconceptions regarding language, culture, teaching, and learning among some members of the campus community. The dilemmas in Jin and Cortazzi’s (2001) concept

of cultural synergy are a useful heuristic for thinking critically about teaching and learning in an internationalized university and making sense of some of the participants' experiences. The relevant dilemmas are listed again here with their descriptions:

- A dilemma of expectations: who expects what and how do we know this?
- A dilemma of change: who changes; is this imposed or negotiated?
- A dilemma of choice: what are the real choices regarding the right to learn with different cultures of learning when some are differentially recognized in terms of status or power?
- A dilemma of context: what are participants' perceptions of the validity of different aspects of cultures of learning in different academic contexts?
- A dilemma of identity: [...] how do cultures of learning relate to multiple identities? (p.2)

A poststructural view of subjectivity is invoked in the *dilemma of identity*:

“Because the individual is subject to multiple and competing discourses in many realms, one's subjectivity is shifting and contradictory—not stable, fixed, rigid” (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2008, p. 477). As discussed elsewhere in this chapter, I found evidence of shifting subjectivities among my participants as they encountered others at UU, exemplifying this dilemma.

The *dilemma of change* was at times manifest in the roles that UU staff took on. Two of the staff participants described taking on the role of intercultural interpreter and advocate. In this role, they attempted to juggle the responsibilities of helping their own culturally and linguistically diverse students improve their English proficiency and adapt to the culture of learning at UU while also trying to dispel myths and misconceptions that other UU faculty and staff had about the students and about language and culture, thereby shifting the discourses.

The *dilemma of change* also interacted with the *dilemma of expectations*. Some UU staff participants struggled at times deciding what they could or should expect from

their international students. Some faculty thought that all students should be treated more or less the same, so, for example, rather than making accommodations on exams for students who were L2 English users, one UU staff participant instituted a dictionary policy for all of her students:

I don't change the course design. Everybody gets one time to write the paper. If you need help writing it – including native speaking students, because they are not all that great in their own English skills – then find somebody to help you. There are resources to do that. Um, in terms of allowing dictionaries and exams, I actually allow everybody to bring in a [...] paper-based dictionary. [...] I try and make it an equal playing field for everybody, whether they're native speaker or non-native speaker. (85.7)

She seems to have taken a stance for equality rather than for equity. Her rationale for this stance is that the students have made a choice to come to UU: “I come from a structure where the assumption is you choose to go to a school that's not from your home country, you then work with the language and the course work and the norms of that country” (85.6). Another staff member expressed a similar point of view as a way to rationalize her decision to adopt a pragmatic approach to teaching English for academic purposes (Harwood & Hadley, 2004): “I'm not coming to you and saying you need to do this. You have come here. You want to be successful here. If you want to be successful here here's what you have to do” (86.11).

While this assumption regarding choice may hold true in many cases, a critical perspective can be taken to problematize agency. Critical questions might include (1) how informed that choice was; (2) what role UU played in the students' decisions to come here—did the UU actively recruit the students? How did UU ascertain the students' readiness and decide to grant them admission? How clearly are the expectations set out for international students? (3) How many of the culturally and linguistically diverse

students are refugees or immigrants whose level of choice may not have been the same as that of the students here on F-1 and J-1 visas?

In these examples, participants struggled with defining their expectations for their students. The *dilemma of choice* played a role here, as well, because choice is regulated by the discourses, which set expectations of acceptable behavior through normalization of some behaviors and through erasure of some knowledge and practices. The *dilemma of context* also came into play in the discourse of the “good student,” of the construction of international students as burden, and in the il/legitimacy discourses of language. All of these dilemmas work in concert to determine the need for change, leading back to the *dilemma of change* and related questions of responsibility and support.

Questions of responsibility were evident in the interviews. There seemed to be an assumption among many participants—both students and staff—that international students bore most or all of the burden to learn about and adapt to the cultures of learning at UU. A similar view is represented and critiqued in the literature on IHE (e.g., Crichton & Scarino, 2007; Kingston & Forland, 2008). Many of the participants called for support and understanding from the UU community to accompany the students’ efforts at change. Interestingly, willingness on the part of UU staff to increase intercultural understanding and to change some behaviors was not always accompanied by a sense of responsibility to do so on one’s own. The comment of one UU staff participant illustrates this point:

No one has ever developed – that I’m aware of – some kind of a, training regimen, or policy, or even just some kind of a session that professors would have to take even once in their career to say, ‘hey. Here’s some things to be aware of. Here’s some things you should know about being culturally sensitive, or things that might help your international students.’ *Nobody’s ever put that in front of me* [emphasis added].

In contrast, there seems to be an assumption that international students would or should

take initiative to learn about the expectations at UU and to seek out assistance, as needed, to overcome any problems they had with language, content, or cultural expectations.

The differential framing of responsibility—which lies at the heart of the dilemma of change—occurs within discursive framings of the notion of support. *Support for faculty* and *support for international students* are constituted differently in the discourse. The former is often heard in discourses of professional development—universities need to support faculty so they can do their jobs. However, in this case it is also tied to deficit discourses with implicit references to colonialism: international students (the Other) need support to make up for their deficiencies, and faculty need support in order to assume this burden. As Holborow (2006) asked about the TESOL profession, it may be relevant to ask whether this framing constitutes “the updated version of the *white man’s burden*?” (p. 85, emphasis in the original).

The programs that are designed to help international students assimilate to the local discursive notion of “university student” are themselves complicit in the colonial project (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Alastair Pennycook, 1998, 2001) by reducing views of cultural differences to, for example, a Western/Eastern dichotomy (Kubota, 1999, as cited in Pennycook, 2001). “Such views are based on a form of cultural determinism that reproduces colonial relations of self and other” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 146). They ignore the multiple and shifting identities and resources of the students while flattening the notion of difference into only a matter of (national) “cultural difference.”

I argue for a shift in the discourse to equalize the distribution of power. What we have at UU are groups coming together from different cultures of learning and with different linguistic and communication resources. In the cultural synergy orientation that

I advocate, everyone shares the responsibility to work together for mutual understanding, personal growth, and individual and mutual learning.

Discussion of Participant Conceptualizations of IHE

As described in Chapter IV, the student and staff participants discussed a range of views regarding what it might mean for a university to internationalize, how internationalization was playing out at UU, and what else could be done to further internationalization efforts at UU. The participants spoke about IHE in terms of structures, processes, rationales, and effects leading to internationalization of the student body, the student experience, and the curriculum (Liddicoat, 2004, as cited in Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008). Student mobility and language courses were the most frequently mentioned structural markers of internationalization, and they were valued for the potential impact they could have on intercultural learning and a broadening of student and faculty perspectives. Participants also made explicit or implicit reference to several of the rationales for IHE discussed in the literature (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004, 2008), and they tended to view IHE as a complex process.

Both study abroad programs for domestic students and the enrollment of international students at UU were included in discussions of student mobility. One UU staff participant spoke of the push–pull factors (Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002) that contribute to international student enrollment. Student mobility was also tied to several rationales, including sociocultural ones (de Wit, 1998, 2002; Knight, 2004), with the most frequently mentioned being the opportunity for intercultural communication and learning. Additional potential benefits of recruiting and admitting international students mentioned by participants mapped neatly onto other rationales and approaches to IHE named in the

literature. For example, some participants talked about the financial benefit of admitting more international students due to the higher rate of tuition they pay as non-resident students, implying an economic rationale (de Wit, 1998, 2002; Knight, 2004) for IHE. A few participants tied this rationale directly to recruiting efforts, which Cravcenco (2004) characterized as academic entrepreneurialism. One of the student participants, Donghyun, suggested that increased recruitment of international students from Korea would help raise the institutional profile and reputation (Knight, 2004, 2008) of UU there, with successful Korean alumni attracting more talented students to UU through an alumni pipeline. This view of international student recruitment aligns with what Cravcenco (2004) called an ideology of academic elitism.

One of the most interesting findings was the difference in opinion regarding how or whether to promote internationalization, intercultural interaction, or some kind of intercultural learning. One of the staff participants held the opinion that it was necessary to force interaction across cultural lines. She would assign her students to culturally diverse groups to give them the opportunity to interact with and get to know students from other cultures. Some other participants—including students and staff—expressed the opinion that intercultural learning was not something that could be forced. One staff member offered an analogy by way of explaining her view that faculty should not be required to add international components to their courses. This view can be critiqued on two levels. The first is similar to Crichton and Scarino's (Crichton & Scarino, 2007) critique of the "culture as content" conceptualization of the cultural component of IHE. She may be conceiving of curricular internationalization under the limited additive approach with a knowledge-dissemination view of teaching and learning (De Vita & Case,

2003). Notwithstanding the approach taken to internationalization of curricula, if UU decides to prioritize intercultural learning, it could then require that all instructors possess some level of intercultural understanding and competence in order to be able to promote the development of intercultural competence in their students. This is one of the possible components of IHE and one thing that UU needs to decide, and the decision will depend on the rationales and goals of IHE.

There is much evidence in the literature that simple intercultural contact is not sufficient for intercultural learning (Otten, 2003). If the decision is made that ICC will be represented in student learning outcomes, then faculty will need to take an active role in promoting intercultural interaction and learning, and it will help if they model qualities that have been found to be necessary for intercultural learning to occur, among them being openness, respect for others, and empathy (Bennett, 1998; Caliguri, 2000; Kim, 2105). These qualities, along with host culture receptivity and host conformity pressure, play an important role in facilitating the adjustment of international students to the culture of learning at UU (Kim, 2105)

Discussion of Discourses Within IHE at UU

The discourse analysis in Chapter V identified some of the discourses circulating at UU with respect to internationalization, international and culturally and linguistically diverse students, and language and culture. I looked at the subject positions created for international students within the discourses and with the use of lexical labels, as well as the subject positions that were taken up by or resisted by the students. An important finding was the presence of competing discourses that constructed international students in different ways. The main discursive strategies I considered were the negative

representations of international students as burdens within discourses of deficit; representations of international students as resources or as commodities within market-based discourses of IHE; the construction of the Other as the one who bears responsibility to change, absolving the university and HCN staff and students of responsibility; and discourses of legitimacy and illegitimacy that constitute and normalize the good student.

Other research has highlighted negative subject positions imposed on L2 users. In a study on the identity constructions of female East Asian international students in the USA, it was found that participants faced struggles with, and at times resisted, externally imposed (constructed) identities (Hsieh, 2007). In her study of social identity processes among immigrant women in Canada, Norton Peirce (1995) showed that social interactions take place within larger social structures that frequently involve inequities, but also demonstrated ways in which language learners struggle against their positioning to construct more favorable identities. I also noted examples of students positioning themselves in ways to reject some of the subject positions that were imposed in the discourses. For example, Jiyeong was able to position herself as a knowledgeable student and proficient English speaker through her choice of partners in group activities and assignments.

I found that lexical labels contributed to the construction of students in ways that are potentially harmful and frequently essentializing. The power inherent in language and discourse was evident in many of the binary oppositions of lexical labels used to refer to students, which at times constituted a form of othering. *Othering* has been defined as “the ways in which the discourse of a particular group defines other groups in opposition to itself: an Us and Them view that constructs an identity for the Other and, implicitly, for

the Self” (Palfreyman , 2005, pp. 213-214). I discussed many instances of this kind of opposition in Chapter V. The opposition of *international students* to *our students* and *U students*, for example, marginalizes international students and constructs them as outsiders who are not included in the UU community, a sentiment at odds with discourses of integration and intercultural learning. It seems, then, that the acceptance of the international students as full members of the UU community is contested—a view that some of the student participants also expressed, with some students positioning themselves as members and others seeing themselves as not quite belonging to the community.

Deficit discourses, which some of the participants were aware of and spoke about their attempts at deconstructing, constituted international students as a burden to UU. In this view, the students potentially divert resources of both time and money away from faculty and from other students as programs and structures are developed to address their “deficiencies.” An ethnocentric view of cultures of learning contributed to the perception of difference as deficit, such that international students were at times positioned as lazy or as lacking in knowledge, skills, and ability. This construction of international students as a deficient other served to reinforce or normalize the *good student* discourse, which is another example of the discourse–power–knowledge relation that constructs truths that determine acceptable and unacceptable behavior and practices. “Power operates when educators seek to identify who is normal and who is not and then seek to make these students more normal” (Capper, 1998, p. 365).

As subjectivities are constituted through these discourses, students may resist them or they may regulate their behaviors according to the normalized practices. I found

an example of this kind of self-regulation among international students who positioned themselves as good students and refrained from using sources written in languages other than English (LOTEs) in their academic writing. Pam learned to regulate her use of Mandarin when she was told by an instructor that she could not use a source written in the language for her paper on Chinese languages and dialects. Amber and Dan demonstrated complicity with discourses of il/legitimacy of languages and language use. They expressed a view that using sources in LOTEs would generate suspicion and mark them as potential violators of academic integrity—a view that was corroborated by a UU staff member—to explain their decision not to use Mandarin sources in their writing. A second UU staff member considered the possibility that another factor that contributed to the discourses of il/legitimacy was a perceived lack of validity of sources not in English or knowledges from outside Anglo-Western epistemologies.

This discourse of il/legitimacy has many effects. It others LOTEs—hence Pennycook’s (2001) recasting of *LOTE* as *LOBE* for “languages othered by English”—and their users by placing them in a hierarchical relation to English, reinforcing the hegemony of English. It also contributes to another destructive process called erasure. Gal and Irvine (Capper, 1998) define *erasure* as “the process in which ideology, in simplifying the field of linguistic practices, renders some persons or activities or sociolinguistic phenomena invisible” (p. 974). In this case, it is the “invisible reality” (Ortega, 2010) of bilinguality or translanguaging that is erased. This erasure—the removal UU students’ knowledge of languages other than English—contributes to a discourse of inadequacy (Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008) by making the linguistic knowledge of multilingual English users appear to be less than that of a (monolingual)

“native speaker” rather than more. As I described in Chapter V, international students were often labeled *non-native speakers* in the interviews. But it is not only the languages themselves but also the knowledge created and expressed in LOTE that are erased. Finally, from a pedagogical standpoint, this ban on using LOTE in source-based writing denies the students opportunities to learn how to translanguage in their writing and how to cite sources in LOTE.

My findings suggest that the “monolingual mindset” (Clyne, 2005, 2007, as cited in Liddicoat & Crichton, 2008) identified in Australia may be at work at UU, as well. This mindset is characterized by a privileging of “a single language (English) within what is in reality a plurilingual context” (p. 368). I agree with Liddicoat and Crichton’s claim that the effect of the privileging of English is to deny the legitimacy of other languages and of plurilingualism and that its origin is the normalization of English monolingualism (Ellis, 2006). I have demonstrated how the monolingual mindset and discourses of il/legitimacy allow L2 English-speaking international students to be constructed as inadequate—a deficit view of L2 users. The issue of the acceptability of LOTE at UU illustrates the interaction of discourses. International students are often represented as being prone to academic dishonesty, so some students reject that representation and take up the subject position of the good student by regulating their translanguageing behaviors to align with the discourses of il/legitimacy.

I am encouraged by the counter discourses legitimizing translanguageing and the use of LOTE at UU in localized contexts such as some UU staff participants’ own classrooms and in more widespread efforts such as the Culture and Languages Across the Curriculum Programs and other efforts to increase the study and use of languages. My

“preferred future” (Alastair Pennycook, 2001) of IHE at UU includes the continued support of these efforts to shift the discourses and legitimate translanguaging practices.

The deficit discourses that constituted international students as a burden to UU also at times represented them as a potential threat. This threat to the academy was constructed in many ways, including increased class sizes and curricular changes. Some of the UU staff participants spoke about not wanting to “dumb-down,” “remedialize,” or “handicap” courses or material for (deficient and burdensome) international students. This finding is similar to what Devos (2003) found in her analysis of the discourses of academic standards in Australia, wherein othering occurred in an Us and Them dichotomy that pitted the “corrupting international student” (p. 165) as the cause for declining standards against the beleaguered faculty member as guardian of academic standards and victim to the corrupting influence of the Other. The difference in my analysis, however, is that my participants who expressed fears over the integrity of the curriculum also often expressed uncertainties about their own intercultural knowledge and understanding. In the face of the discourses of threat, some UU staff members stated their desire to improve their ability to help all of their students succeed, as this excerpt illustrates:

I would love to know if there was some body of knowledge, that would make the experience more pleasant, more productive, more effective for my international students. I would love to know what does work. If there were techniques that I could be adopting, I would love to adopt them. (99.79)

They seemed to acknowledge their own limitations rather than lay blame solely on international students. In light of this desire to make adjustments in the classroom, the use of negative terms such as “dumbing down” speaks to a misunderstanding of what culturally and linguistically responsive teaching (discussed below) might entail. It

remains to be seen whether faculty would embrace or resist this approach to teaching if they were given the opportunity to learn about it, but the discourses representing international students as resources could support the use of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching.

International students were also represented in a positive light in the interviews and UU documents. They were often constructed as resources for internationalization—cultural agents in service to the development of intercultural knowledge or competence among other members of the campus community. Commonly in this discourse, though, it is everyone else who is expected to benefit from the presence of the international students with much less common explicit reference made to what those students themselves might gain. In this way, international students are positioned as commodities within market-based discourses of IHE (Kubota, 2009; Stier, 2004). This positioning is even clearer when reference is made to international students as revenue streams.

Another subject position that emerged in my analysis was international student as diplomat. In interviews with both students and UU staff, there was mention of international students returning to their home countries after their time at UU and both representing the University to potential students and potential employers of UU alumni and disseminating American values. This discursive strategy can be viewed in terms of colonialism (Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Smith, 1999) and a “soft” imperial strategy (Nye 2004, as cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p. 11): “the most effective spokespeople for spreading American power abroad are not Americans but indigenous surrogates.”

Limitations

As is always the case with any research, there are several limitations to this study. First of all, given the qualitative research design with a focus on localized conditions and knowledge, generalizability was not a goal of this study. The findings will, however, be of interest to others working in the internationalization of higher education and may serve as a springboard for research or practice in their contexts.

Another limitation that is common in research is the effect that my own biases and perspectives have had on the entire process, including the questions I asked, my selection of participants, and my interpretations and presentation of my findings. The data story that I present here is one of many possible stories that could be told had I selected different points on which to focus. In addition, there were many more people I could have interviewed—and would have liked to—and interviewees I would have liked to follow up with more had it not been for the constraints of time.

All of the interviews were conducted in English, which presents another limitation. The L2 English users among my participants may have expressed themselves differently had they been able to do so in another language. The study is also limited by the fact that all of the literature I reviewed was written in English, which both limits the review and implicates me in the hegemony of English in the academy.

Implications

Several findings in this research serve as reminders to be mindful of the language we use to talk about others and to examine our assumptions about teaching, learning, language, and culture. “Even if our reasons are well intentioned, we need to consider that, in the process of labeling students, we put ourselves in the powerful position of

rhotorically constructing their identities, a potentially hazardous enterprise” (Spack, 1997, p. 765). The research has also identified several strengths as well as areas for improvement in internationalization at UU, specifically, in the development of intercultural competence, in opportunities for language learning and use, and the development of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogies.

While it is impossible to generalize my findings from a small set of participants to the entire UU, I do think they merit further exploration. The finding that some UU staff members are experiencing frustrations and tensions, and that they report the lack of policies or conversations about internationalization and intercultural learning within their departments, may indicate a possible need for a more cohesive strategy for internationalization at all levels, including in colleges and departments. The discussions would need to begin from rationales, approaches, and goals for internationalization at UU, and expectations will be for all faculty and students need to be determined. Those expectations should align with the rationales and goals decided at the university, college, and departmental level. UU is well poised to undertake these discussions with the Office for Global Engagement setting a structure and providing guidance to colleges and departments to meet their varying programmatic needs.

The way that some of the UU staff participants spoke about not wanting to “handicap” or “dumb down” courses to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students seems to indicate that they may not be aware that there are ways to adapt their teaching that do not include "watering down" the content. Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, an approach developed for teacher education programs, could be adapted to suit the needs of UU faculty and students.

In response to the changing demographic in U.S. schools resulting in a more culturally and linguistically diverse student body, educators in teacher education programs are calling for changes to address the needs of students (e.g., Fillmore & Snow, 2000; Short & Echevarria, 2004/2005; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Responses to this call have included courses in areas such as teacher language awareness, content-based instruction, and multicultural or bilingual education. Another approach that has gained some currency for teacher education is Villegas and Lucas's (2002, 2007) culturally responsive teaching. Developed for K-12 teacher training, the framework has been suggested for use in higher education contexts (Gallagher, Haan, & Varandani, 2015) that are also experiencing a change in demographics. It outlines six salient characteristics of culturally responsive teachers:

- sociocultural consciousness;
- an affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds;
- a commitment and development of skills to act as agents of change;
- a constructivist view of learning;
- an interest in and learning stance towards students; and
- culturally responsive teaching practices. (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007)

Other recommendations, which overlap with some of the tenets of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, have been developed specifically for teaching in higher education. Hafernik and Wiant (2012) offer similar advice to college faculty for creating classrooms that foster student success for all students:

- develop a positive orientation to differences among students in terms of their abilities and potentials, not a deficit perspective (difference as resource vs.

difference deficit);

- avoid making assumptions about students and their knowledge, abilities, and experiences;
- try to get to know students as individuals;
- help students become members of the academy and insiders in their disciplines; and
- cultivate intellectual curiosity in students.

The Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence and the Intercultural Communication Center at Carnegie Mellon University offer the following advice to their faculty:

- Make your expectations far more explicit than you may think is necessary.
- Model the kinds of work you want your students to do.
- Represent the material you are teaching in multiple ways.
- Give students ample opportunities to practice applying the knowledge and skills you want them to acquire, and provide feedback to guide the development of new skills.
- Provide varied opportunities for student-student and student-faculty interaction. (Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence and Intercultural Communication Center, n.d.)

In the spirit of leveraging the strengths at UU to do more of what UU already does well (University of Utah, 2012), I recommend that ESL professionals at UU collaborate with faculty from other departments to aid in the implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching across the campus. A few of the student participants noted a difference between their ESL instructors—who made sure that their students

could understand them, provided a variety of learning activities in the classroom, and gave helpful feedback on their writing—and other professors who did not seem to be aware of the level of the students’ understanding and did not often provide feedback on their writing.³⁵

Increased collaboration between experienced ESL instructors and other faculty—perhaps in the form of a faculty learning community, a model that has shown success in student learning in higher education (Cox, 2002, 2004)—could have multiple benefits. The ESL instructors would learn more about what their students need to do in classes in other departments at UU, and they could adapt or create new EAP courses to better meet those needs. The other faculty could learn more about the effects that culture and language have on learning from the instructors who specialize in these areas or they could share their own successful approaches in the classroom with their colleagues. Benefits to student learning may extend beyond international students to the student body at large with the introduction of instructional strategies that promote learning within a constructivist framework.

³⁵ Again, I must caution that the findings are limited and local, but they represent a starting point to investigate the need for the changes I recommend.

REFERENCES

- ACE. (2011). *Examples of good practice in internationalization*. From <http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/cii/tool/good/index.htm>
- Altbach, P. G. (2006). The dilemmas of ranking. *International Higher Education*, 42, 2–3.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3), 290–305.
- Altbach, P. G., & McGill Peterson, P. (2006). Internationalize American higher education: Not exactly. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *International higher education: Reflections on policy and practice* (pp. 63–67). Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, Center for International Higher Education (CIHE).
- Altinsel, Z., & Rittenberg, W. (1996). *Cultural support for international TAs: An undergraduate buddy program*. Paper presented at the Conference of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Chicago, IL.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED407918&site=ehost-live>
- Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71, 319–342.
- Amir, Y. (1998). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 162–181). New York: Continuum Publishing.
- Andrade, M. S. (2010). Increasing accountability: Faculty perspectives on the English language competence of nonnative English speakers. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(3), 221–239. doi: 10.1177/1028315308331295
- Arnold, J. E. (1999). *Affect in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Baik, C., & Greig, J. (2009). Improving the academic outcomes of undergraduate ESL students: the case for discipline-based academic skills programs. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(4), 401–416. doi:

10.1080/07294360903067005

- Bailey, K. M. (1983). Foreign teaching assistants at U.S. universities: Problems in interaction and communication. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 308–310.
- Bailey, K. M., Pialorsi, F., & Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Foreign teaching assistants in U.S. universities*. Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Ball, S. J. (1990). Self-doubt and soft data: Social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3(2), 157–171.
- Baronov, D. (2004). *Conceptual foundations of social research methods*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, 45(1), 43.
- Bartram, B. (2008). Supporting international students in higher education: Constructions, cultures and clashes. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(6), 657–668. doi: 10.1080/13562510802452384
- Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59–88.
- Bennett, M. J. (1998). Overcoming the Golden Rule: Sympathy and empathy. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Selected readings* (pp. 191–214). Boston: Intercultural Press.
- Benzie, H. (2010). Graduating as a 'native speaker': international students and English language proficiency in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(4), 447.
- Binghamton University, SUNY. (n.d.). *Languages across the curriculum (LXC)*. from <http://lxc.binghamton.edu/>
- Bonfiglio, O. (1999). The difficulties of internationalizing the American undergraduate curriculum. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(2), 3–18. doi: 10.1177/102831539900300202
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62 (Winter), 15–17.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 413–431.
- Buckridge, M., & Guest, R. (2007). A conversation about pedagogical responses to increased diversity in university classrooms. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(2), 133–146. doi: 10.1080/07294360701310771
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Byrnes, H., (Ed.). (2009). The role of foreign language departments in internationalizing the curriculum [Perspectives]. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(iv), 607–627.
- Caliguri, P. M. (2000). Selecting expatriates for personality characteristics: A moderating effect of personality on the relationship between host national contact and cross-cultural adjustment. *Management International Review*, 40, 61–80.
- Capper, C. A. (1998). Critically oriented and postmodern perspectives: Sorting out the differences and applications for practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(3), 354–379.
- Carabine, J. (2001). Unmarried motherhood 1830–1990: A genealogical analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 267–310). London: Sage.
- Cargile, A. C. (2015). Language matters. In L. A. Samovar, R. E. Porter, E. R. McDaniel & C. S. Roy (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (14th ed., pp. 251–259). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Chang, M. J. (2002). Preservation or transformation: Where's the real educational discourse on diversity? *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 125–140.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Childers, S. M. (2011). Getting in trouble: Feminist postcritical policy ethnography in an

- urban school. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(4), 345–354.
- Childress, L. (2007). *Faculty engagement in the operationalization of internationalization plans* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1428848091&Fmt=7&clientId=9456&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Chodosh, H. (2011, November). *Making the connection: International education and careers in a global society*. Panel chaired by G. Allen at the 2nd Annual Utah International Higher Education Summit, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Collins, J. (2001). Selling the market: Educational standards, discourse and social inequality. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(2), 143–163. doi: 10.1177/0308275x0102100202
- Cook, V. J. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cox, M. D. (2002). Achieving teaching and learning excellence through faculty learning communities. *Essays on Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy*, 14(4). Retrieved from http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/files/vol14no4_learning_communities.htm
- Cox, M. D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 2004(97), 5–23.
- Cravenceno, L. P. (2004). *Internationalization of American universities and the changing ideology of international student recruitment: A case analysis of four midwest colleges and universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.utah.edu/docview/305174419?accountid=14677>
- Crichton, J., & Scarino, A. (2007). How are we to understand the 'intercultural dimension'? An examination of the intercultural dimension of internationalisation in the context of higher education in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 4.1–4.21.
- De Vita, G., & Case, P. (2003). Rethinking the internationalisation agenda in UK higher education. *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, 27(4), 383–398. doi: 10.1080/0309877032000128082
- de Wit, H. (1998). Rationales for internationalisation of higher education. *Millenium on.line*, 11. <http://www.ipv.pt/millenium/wit11.htm>

- de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Dei, G. J. S., & Asgharzadeh, A. (2001). The power of social theory: The anti-colonial discursive framework. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 35(3), 297–323.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 1–43). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Devos, A. (2003). Academic standards, internationalisation, and the discursive construction of "the international student." *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(2), 155–166.
- Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence and Intercultural Communication Center. (n.d.). *Recognizing and addressing cultural variations in the classroom*. Retrieved from <http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/resources/PublicationsArchives/InternalReports/culturalvariations.pdf>
- Edley, N. (2001). Analysng masculinity: Interpretative repertoires, ideological dilemmas, and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 189–228). London: Sage
- Edwards, J. D., Lenker, A. L., & Kahn, D. (2008–2009). National language policies: Pragmatism, process, and products. *NECTFL Review, Fall/Winter*(63), 2–42.
- Ehrman, M. (1996). An exploration of adult language learner motivation, self-efficacy, and anxiety. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 81–103): University of Hawai'i: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Ellis, E. M. (2006). Monolingualism: The unmarked case. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 7(2), 173–196.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Alexandria, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Fischer, K. (2008). Community colleges pursue many paths to create international campuses. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(10), 42–42.
- Fischer, K. (2011). Colleges adapt to new kinds of students from abroad. *Chronicle of*

Higher Education. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Educate-a-New-Kind-of/127704/?sid=gn&utm_source

- Fisher, M. (1985). Rethinking the "foreign TA problem." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 1985(22), 63–73. Abstract retrieved from ERIC. (Accession No. EJ318661). doi: 10.1002/tl.37219852207
- Fitch, F., & Morgan, S. E. (2003). "Not a lick of English": Constructing the ITA identity through student narratives. *Communication Education*, 52(3–4), 297–310.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2008). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 115–159). Los Angeles: Sage
- Foucault, M. (2007). *The politics of truth*. S. Lotringer (Ed.), Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. T. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, 62(4), 967–1001.
- Gallagher, C. E., Haan, J., & Varandani, L. (2015). "Not all faculty can or should become ESL experts": University faculty perceptions of their work with international English learners. Paper presented at the AAAL Annual Conference, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Gamradt, J. (1998). "Studying up" in educational anthropology. In K. B. deMarrais (Ed.), *Inside stories: Qualitative research reflections* (pp. 67–78). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local* (pp. 140–158). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan (formerly Orient Longman).
- Gehlhar, J. N. (2009). Of course they want us at the curriculum internationalization table. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(4), 616–618. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00935.x
- Goodman, A. E. (2009). Language learning and study abroad: The path to global citizenship. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(4), 610–612.
- Graham, S. (1997). *Effective language learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Green, M. F. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at research universities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, R. (2010). *Border pedagogy and the acculturation of Korean students in U.S.*

- institutions of higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=2148975831&Fmt=7&clientId=9456&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Grosz, E. A. (1994). *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Guerin, S. H. (2009). Internationalizing the curriculum: Improving learning through international education: preparing students for success in a global society. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 33(8), 611–614. doi: 10.1080/10668920902928945
- Gurin, P., Day, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330–366.
- Hafernik, J. J., & Wiant, F. M. (2012). *Integrating multilingual students into college classrooms*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Haigh, M. (2008). Internationalisation, planetary citizenship and Higher Education Inc. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 38(4), 427–440.
- Haigh, M. (2009). The Sattvic curriculum: A three-level, non-Western, superstructure for undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2009(118), 61–70. doi: 10.1002/tl.353
- Haigh, M. J. (2002). Internationalisation of the curriculum: Designing inclusive education for a small world. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(1), 49–66. doi: 10.1080/03098260120110368
- Halleck, G. B. (2008). The ITA problem: A ready-to-use simulation. *Simulation & Gaming*, 39(1), 137–146.
- Hammer, M. R., Gudykunst, W. B., & Wiseman, R. L. (1979). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2(4), 382–393.
- Harwood, N., & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: Critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 355–377.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Hellstén, M., & Prescott, A. (2004). Learning at university: The international student experience. *International Education Journal*, 5(3), 344–351.

- Hill, J. H. (2008). *The everyday language of White racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(3), 301–320. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(86\)90015-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(86)90015-5)
- Holborow, M. (2006). Ideology and language: Interconnections between neo-liberalism and English. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)Locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 84–103). New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Holbrook, K. A. (2008). The global STEM imperative. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 43(2), 8–9.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal: English Language Teachers Journal*, 60(4), 385–387. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccl030
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2003). Active interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing* (pp. 67–80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Horn, A. S., Hendel, D. D., & Fry, G. W. (2007). Ranking the international dimension of top research universities in the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 330–358. doi: 10.1177/1028315306294630
- Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. E. (1991). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hsieh, M. (2007). Identity development of East Asian female international students with implications for second-language higher education. *Education Economics*, 27(1), 3–15.
- Hughes, R. (2008). Internationalisation of higher education and language policy: Questions of quality and equity. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20(1), 102–119.
- Institute of International Education. (2010, November 15). *International student enrollments rose modestly in 2009/10, led by strong increase in students from*

- China* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://iie.org/en/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2010/2010-11-15-Open-Doors-International-Students-In-The-US>
- Institute of International Education. (2011). *OpenDoors 2010 fast facts* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <http://iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>
- Institute of International Education. (2012). *Open Doors FAQs*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/FAQ-faq4>
- Institute of International Education. (2014). *OpenDoors 2014 fast facts* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <http://www.opendoors.iienetwork.org>
- Institute of International Education. (2014, November 17). *Open Doors 2014: International students in the United States and study abroad by American students are at all-time high* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2014/2014-11-17-Open-Doors-Data>
- Institute of International Education. (November 12, 2012). *Open Doors 2012: International student enrollment increased by 6 percent: International education exchanges are at all-time high, strengthening economies and societies around the world*. [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2012/11-13-2012-Open-Doors-International-Students>
- Jackson, M. G. (2003). Internationalising the university curriculum. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 27(3), 325–340.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200–207. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x
- Jia, C. L., & Bergerson, A. A. (2008). Understanding the International Teaching Assistant training program: A case study at a northwestern research university. *International Education*, 37(2), 77–98.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (1997/1998). Expectations and questions in intercultural classrooms. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 7(2), 37–58.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2001). *Cultural synergy: Using Chinese strengths for learning in EAP*. Paper presented at the BALEAP Professional Issues Meeting: Focus on Chinese Learners, Sheffield Hallam University. Handout retrieved from <http://www.baleap.org.uk/baleap/conference-events/pims/pim-reports/focus-chinese-learners/opening-plenary-session/lixian-jin-martin-cortazzi-handout>.
- Johnson, E. M. (2008). An investigation into pedagogical challenges facing international

- tertiary-level students in New Zealand. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(3), 231–243. doi: 10.1080/07294360802183796
- Joseph, C. (2008). Difference, subjectivities and power: (de)colonizing practices in internationalizing the curriculum. *Intercultural Education*, 19(1), 29–39. doi: 10.1080/14675980701852350
- Kabel, A. (2009). Native-speakerism, stereotyping and the collusion of applied linguistics. *System*, 37(1), 12–22. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2008.09.004
- Kachru, B. B. (1989). Teaching world Englishes. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 85–95.
- Kahane, D. (2009). Learning about obligation, compassion, and global justice: The place of contemplative pedagogy. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2009(118), 49–60. doi: 10.1002/tl.352
- Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 260-273. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303534
- Kim, Y. Y. (2105). Adapting to a new culture. In L. A. Samovar, R. E. Porter, E. R. McDaniel & C. S. Roy (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (14th ed., pp. 385–397). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2008). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 403–455). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Kingston, E., & Forland, H. (2008). Bridging the gap in expectations between international students and academic staff. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(2), 204–221.
- Klee, C. A. (2009). Internationalization and foreign languages: The Resurgence of interest in languages across the curriculum. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(4), 618–621. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00936.x
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5–31. doi: 10.1177/1028315303260832
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization* (Vol. 13). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62 (Winter), 14–15.

- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), 9–35.
- Kubota, R. (2009). Internationalization of universities: Paradoxes and responsibilities. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(4), 612–616. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00934.x
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Dangerous liaison: Globalization, empire and TESOL. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)Locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 1–26). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(4), 673–693.
- Lather, P. (1996). Troubling clarity: The politics of accessible language. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 525–546.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1997). Acculturation isn't everything. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 39–43. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01089.x
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Crichton, J. (2008). The monolingual framing of international education in Australia. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 2(3), 367–384.
- Linden, R. R. (1993). *Making stories, making selves: Feminist reflections on the Holocaust*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Lo, W. Y. W. (2011). Soft power, university rankings and knowledge production: Distinctions between hegemony and self-determination in higher education. *Comparative Education*, 47(2), 209–222. doi: 10.1080/03050068.2011.554092
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). Variables underlying willingness to communicate: A causal analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 11(2), 135–142.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dornyei, Z., Clement, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562.
- Martin, K. (2008). “Do you know China?”: TAs journey into new territory for International Education Week. *ITAIS Newsletter*, 13(1). Retrieved from http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_issue.asp?nid=3205&iid=10828&sid=1

- Mazzarol, T., & Soutar, G. N. (2002). "Push-pull" factors influencing international student destination choice. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 16(2), 82–90.
- McGill Peterson, P. (2010). The centrality of faculty to a more globally oriented campus. In D. B. Johnstone, M. B. d'Ambrosio & P. J. Yakoboski (Eds.), *Higher education in a global society* (pp. 134–147). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Mehan, H. (1996). The construction of an LD student: A case study in the politics of representation. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (Eds.), *Natural histories of discourse* (pp. 253–276). Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (2002). In search of a comprehensive approach to international education: A systems perspective. In W. Grünzweig & N. Rinehart (Eds.), *Rockin' in Red Square: Critical approaches to international education in the age of cyberculture* (pp. 165–213). Piscataway, NJ: Transaction
- Miike, Y. (2015). "Harmony without uniformity": An Asiacentric worldview and its communicative implications. In L. A. Samovar, R. E. Porter & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (14th ed., pp. 27–41). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Modiano, M. (2001). Ideology and the ELT practitioner. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 159–173.
- Morgan, B. (2007). Poststructuralism and applied linguistics: Complementary approaches to identity and culture in ELT. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (Vol. 2, pp. 949–968). Norwell, MA: Springer.
- Murphey, T., Chen, J., & Chen, L. (2004). Learners' constructions of identities and imagined communities. In P. Benson & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (pp. 83–100). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.
- National Security Education Program. (n.d.). *History of NSEP*. Retrieved from <http://www.nsep.gov/about/history/>
- Oka, K. U. (2007). *Pedagogy of the global: Knowledge, empire and internationalization in the university* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.utah.edu/docview/304758221?accountid=14677> ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) database.

- Olson, C. (2005). Comprehensive internationalization: From principles to practice. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 8, 51–74.
- Oppenheim, N. (1997). *How International Teaching Assistant Programs can prevent lawsuits*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED408886&site=ehost-live>
- Ortbals, C. D., & Rincker, M. E. (2009). Embodied researchers: Gendered bodies, research activity, and pregnancy in the field. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 42(02), 315–319. doi: 10.1017/S1049096509090635
- Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 12–26. doi: 10.1177/1028315302250177
- Paige, R. M. (2003). The American case: The University of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 52–63. doi: 10.1177/1028315302250180
- Paige, R. M., & Mestenhauser, J. A. (1999). Internationalizing educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(4), 500–517. doi: 10.1177/0013161x99354005
- Palfreyman, D. (2005). Othering in an English language program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(2), 211–234.
- Peelo, M., & Luxon, T. (2007). Designing embedded courses to support international students' cultural and academic adjustment in the UK. *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, 31(1), 65–76. doi: 10.1080/03098770601167930
- Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 115–138.
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Vulgar pragmatism, critical pragmatism, and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4), 253–269.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London, GBR: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pennycook, A. (2008). Translingual English. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 31(3), 30.31–30.39. doi: 10.2104/ara10830
- Petro, A. (2006). ITAIS annual report. *ITAIS Newsletter*, 11(2). http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_issue.asp?nid=3205&iid=7303&sid=1

- Pillow, W. S. (2000). Exposed methodology: The body as a deconstructive practice. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 199–219). New York: Routledge.
- Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)*, 16(2), 175–196.
- Prater, M. A., & Devereaux, T. H. (2009). Culturally responsive training of teacher educators. *Action in Teacher Education*, 31(3), 19–27.
- Presidential Task Force on Internationalization of the University. (2006). *Report of the presidential task force on internationalization of the university*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah.
- Price, S. (1999). Critical discourse analysis: Discourse acquisition and discourse practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 581–595.
- Race, J. (1998). Do we all acknowledge the existence of a market in international education? A viewpoint from the academic cooperation agencies. *Millenium on.line*, 11. Retrieved from <http://www.ipv.pt/millenium/race11.htm>
- Ramsay, S., Barker, M., & Jones, E. (1999). Academic adjustment and learning processes: A comparison of international and local students in first-year university. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 18(1), 129–144.
- Ramsay, S., Jones, E., & Barker, M. (2007). Relationship between adjustment and support types: Young and mature-aged local and international first year university students. *Higher Education*, 54(2), 247V265. doi: 10.1007/s10734-006-9001-0
- Ransom, L., Larcombe, W., & Baik, C. (2005). *English language needs and support: International-ESL students' perceptions and expectations*. Paper presented at the 16th ISANA International Conference, Christchurch, New Zealand.
<http://www.services.unimelb.edu.au/ASU/download/ransom-larcombe-baik.pdf>
- Regents of the University of Minnesota. (2003). *International student & scholar services*. from <http://www.iss.umn.edu/>
- Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2008). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed., pp. 473–499). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robertson, M., Line, M., Jones, S., & Thomas, S. (2000). International students, learning environments and perceptions: A case study using the Delphi technique. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(1), 89–102. doi: 10.1080/07294360050020499

- Rogers, R. (2011). Critical approaches to discourse analysis in educational research. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd ed., pp. 1–20). New York: Routledge.
- Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., McDaniel, E. R., & Roy, C. S. (2013). *Communication between cultures* (8th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Schmied, L. A., & Shiba, K. E. (2007). Internationalizing the curriculum: Bringing the world to East Tennessee. *International Education*, 36(2), 70–82.
- Schock, L. (2007). *Internationalizing the campus: Profiles of success at colleges & universities*. Washington, DC: NAFAS Association of International Educators.
- Schoorman, D. (1997). *Internationalization and its pedagogical implications: Understanding and implementing global perspectives in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.utah.edu/docview/304382906?accountid=14677> ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) database.
- Schoorman, D. (1999). The pedagogical implications of diverse conceptualizations of internationalization: A U.S. based case study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(2), 19–46. doi: 10.1177/102831539900300203
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., Van Gyn, G., & Preece, A. (2007). Internationalizing the higher education curriculum: An emerging model for transforming faculty perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 37(1), 67–94.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Short, D., & Echevarria, J. (2004/2005). Teacher skills to support English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 62(4), 8–13.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English Language Learners—A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Silverstein, M., & Urban, G. (Eds.). (1996). *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4), 765–774.

- Spivak, Gayatri C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.
- St. Pierre, E. A., & Pillow, W. S. (2000). Introduction: Inquiry among the ruins. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 1–24). New York: Routledge.
- Steger, M. B. (2003). *Globalization : A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stier, J. (2003). Internationalisation, ethnic diversity and the acquisition of intercultural competencies. *Intercultural Education*, 14(1), 77–91.
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies & Education*, 2(1), 83–97. doi: 10.1080/1476772042000177069
- Stone, N. (2006). Conceptualizing intercultural effectiveness for university teaching. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(4), 334–356.
- Straight, H. S. (2009). The role of FL departments: Enabling and fostering ubiquitous use of languages. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(4), 624–627.
- Strauss, P., & U, A. (2007). Group assessments: dilemmas facing lecturers in multicultural tertiary classrooms. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(2), 147–161. doi: 10.1080/07294360701310789
- Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, 53(1), 81–105. doi: 10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5
- Strong, T. B. (2009). Language learning and the social sciences. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(4), 621–624.
- Teekens, H. (2003). The requirement to develop specific skills for teaching in an intercultural setting. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 108–119. doi: 10.1177/1028315302250192
- The Language Flagship. (2011). *Language programs overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/overview>
- Theobald, R. B. (2008). Internationalization: Institutions, people and programmes in Colorado. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2), 205–216. doi: 10.1080/03098260701731199

- Ting-Toomey, S. (2012). *Communicating across cultures*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Twale, D. J., Shannon, D. M., & Moore, M. S. (1997). NGTA and IGTA training and experience: Comparisons between self-ratings and undergraduate student evaluations. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22(1), 61–77.
- UNC-Chapel Hill Area Studies Centers. (n.d.). *Languages across the curriculum (LAC)*. Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/areastudies/degreeprograms/lac-graduate-certificate.html>
- University of Utah. (2012). *University of Utah strategic vision: Seven core commitments of the new U*. Retrieved from <http://ucomm.test.utah.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Strategic-Plan-June-2012.pdf>.
- University of Utah. (n.d.). *Mission statement*. Retrieved from <http://www.admin.utah.edu/president/mission.html>
- University of Utah Office of Budget & Institutional Analysis. (2011). *Headcount enrollment by state of origin and academic level: 2011 autumn semester census*. Retrieved from <http://www.obia.utah.edu/ia/stat/2011-2012/ss1112A05.pdf>.
- Urciuoli, B. (1999). Producing multiculturalism in higher education: Who's producing what for whom? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)*, 12(3), 287–298. doi: 10.1080/095183999236141
- Urciuoli, B. (2000). Strategically deployable shifters in college marketing, or just what do they mean by "skills" and "leadership" and "multiculturalism"? *Language & Culture Working Paper Symposium #6*. Retrieved from <http://language-culture.binghamton.edu/symposia/6/index.html>
- Urciuoli, B. (2003). Excellence, leadership, skills, diversity: Marketing liberal arts education. *Language and Communication*, 23(3–4), 385–408.
- Urciuoli, B. (2009). Talking/not talking about race: The enregisterments of culture in higher education discourses. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1), 21–39.
- Urciuoli, B. (2010). Entextualizing *diversity*: Semiotic incoherence in institutional discourse. *Language and Communication*, 30(1), 48–57.
- Vainio-Mattila, A. (2009). Internationalizing curriculum: A new kind of education? *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2009(118), 95–103. doi: 10.1002/tl.356
- Van Gyn, G., Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., & Preece, A. (2009). Education for world-mindedness: Beyond superficial notions of internationalization. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2009(118), 25–38. doi: 10.1002/tl.350

- Villegas, A. M. a., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32.
- Villegas, A. M. a., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 28–33.
- Wächter, B. (2003). An introduction: Internationalisation at home in context. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 5–11. doi: 10.1177/1028315302250176
- Wang, D. (2010). Course reorientation to enhance Chinese students' international awareness. In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic, and management perspectives* (pp. 175–189). London: Continuum.
- Watzinger-Tharp, J. (2014). Are global, international, and foreign language studies connected? In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary foreign language teaching in the United States*, (pp. 123–141). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Weedon, C. (2004). *Identity and culture: Narratives of difference and belonging*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Williams, G. (2010). *The academic vocation in an age of commoditization*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Globalization [Keynote address], University of Ilorin. Retrieved from <http://www.unilorin.edu.gn/publiclectures/ACADEMIC VOCATION ilorin.doc>
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2009). *Writing up qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506–521.
- Zhou, J. (2009). What is missing in the international teaching assistants training curriculum? *Journal of Faculty Development*, 23(2), 19–24.
- Zhou, Y. (2010). *The lived experiences of L2 Chinese graduate students in American higher education: A phenomenological narrative inquiry* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=2105210981&Fmt=7&clientId=9456&RQT=309&VName=PQD>